

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

**June 16, 2011 – 9:00 a.m.
Meeting Notes**

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

Others Present: Please see sign in sheet

1. Call to Order

Chairman Raines called the meeting to order at 9:04. She stated there are strict orders from the legislature to make decisions by 2012. There is a lot of work to do and she would appreciate the group's cooperation.

2. Introductions

Self-introductions were made by all attending.

3. Summaries of Finished Reports

a. Final Phase IIB Report, Comments and Responses

Mr. Dave Muller presented a PowerPoint that gave the background on Phase I, which included the PUD contracting with EES Consulting, looking at sites for water retention and multipurpose projects. Phase I was presented to the Flood Authority in February of 2009.

Phase II began with the Flood Authority contracting with EES Consulting for additional studies of two dam sites. Phase IIA was a geological and geotechnical study through Shannon and Wilson, and Phase IIB refined the preliminary work from Phase I.

Phase IIB report went to the Flood Authority in November 2010 and it included engineering conceptual drawings and cost estimates based on the geotechnical information.

Mr. Muller also provided a spreadsheet that summarized comments and responses to the revised report.

Next steps include an extension of the fish studies; benefits and impacts to fish and potential mitigation of impacts of water retention; a complete lower river hydraulic model; evaluation of alternative projects to protect I-5, the airport and medical facility access; alternatives that could provide flood relief and protection in the basin, and an update to the economics and benefits and costs with new information.

Commissioner Averill asked Mr. Muller if there is anything that he would foresee needing to be done between now and July that would require EES Consulting. Mr. Muller stated EES could update the benefit cost after the hydrologic model.

Commissioner Averill stated a place holder is needed. The fish study goes through December. The Corps has suggested that they are ready to do the hydrology study but he questions how that will happen and if they are the right people to do that. Mr. Muller stated the Corps study is not detailed enough for the economics part. The Corps' hydraulic model is for ecosystems but not for flood control.

Commissioner Averill stated if they are going to use the money half of it will come out of the Flood Authority designated money. He also stated that Mr. Goss is working with West to do the hydraulic models.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated initially the PUD proposal was for two dams. She asked Mr. Muller how the second dam came to be eliminated and what did the PUD think about two dams rather than one.

Mr. Muller stated Phase I was to find enough storage in the upper basin for meaningful reductions and the Newaukum site proved to be not a feasible site because there was not enough drainage area. The amount of storage depends on the drainage area and how much it can hold during a 100 year event or worse, such as the 2007 event.

Ms. Powe asked how much time it would take to update the benefit cost.

Mr. Muller stated about three months. The key is the hydraulic model work. Parcel information could be prepared ahead of time even if the model is not ready and then run the model against the elevations. If the model isn't done until June it is too late to update the economic information to report to the legislature.

Commissioner Willis stated that during the fish study briefings it was learned that there was not enough information interjected into the study on the fisheries. Mr. Muller stated from an engineering and economic standpoint they were able to do what was intended. From an engineering and geotechnical side you would need more information such as drilling. That takes a lot of money and it is still down the road, but drilling will give more information.

Commissioner Willis asked on a scale of 1 to 10 where are we with the studies that need to be done. Mr. Muller stated we are at 3 or 4 on a knowledge basis, not a cost basis. We work on smaller pieces and as we learn more we can focus on detailed work. The PUD has spent \$80,000 on Phase I and the Flood Authority has spent \$480,000 on Phase A and B. He does not know how much of the \$800,000 has been spent.

Commissioner Averill stated the request submitted was for \$275,000 to reallocate to the fish study and that is in place.

Ms. Powe stated that Anchor said they had a hard time getting study information from the Tribe. She suggested Mr. Muller could talk to Anchor about what that information is and perhaps the Flood Authority could make a request to the Tribe. Mr. Muller stated early on they were going to rely on a lot of existing information, either from the Tribe or DOE.

Mr. Johnson stated so far EES has spent \$475,000.

b. Final Report from FCS Group

Mr. Ghilarducci stated the report he emailed to the Flood Authority is quite large but the bulk of it is the appendices. The narrative is not real large. He sent a memo out last week summarizing the report section by section and the appendices that were referenced. There are a total of ten reports.

Section 1 is the introduction to the project that talks about the Basin and the Flood Authority, the work plan and schedule.

Section 2 is the economic benefit analysis. It has been updated since Todd Chase's presentation earlier in the year. Black Lake has been taken out. About \$925 million total economic losses resulted from the 2007 flood. On a per day basis the economic value at risk is less than \$6 million per day. About 70% of that is in the flood plain area and 30% is regionally in the basin due to direct and indirect impacts to issues in the flood plain.

There are subsections that include a lot of detail on how we arrived at the numbers. 36% was identified as state-wide impacts due to transportation interruption. \$334 million of the \$935 million was the statewide impact.

Section 3 is the potential governance structures of a basin-wide flood district which was FCS's objective from the start. It summarizes the existing statute for a FCZD (Flood Control Zone District) and compared the two statutes and talks about storm water utilities and Flood Control Districts. There is the recognition that the statutes did not get at some of the issues such as a directly elected board. There is no ability for a multi-jurisdictional entity to raise revenue on its own which led to a multi-county FCZD proposed legislation which did not get out of committee. In July 2010 FCS reported that the Flood Authority was to pursue an Interlocal Agreement (ILA) and support that legislation as a future option.

Section 4 summarizes the public outreach from the fall meetings. There is a report that summarizes the questions and how FCS tried to address them. Some of the issues include public votes, voting on projects, flood reduction project costs, costs of larger projects. People do not want to pay for projects that would benefit other locations; there were concerns about mechanisms for raising money, land use practices, boundaries and notification and better attendance at meetings.

Section 5 is the development of the ILA that was proposed in March. Each Flood Authority member was interviewed to get input as to how to take information to put into the ILA. Topics addressed included membership, boundaries, voting, capital improvement plans, responsibility for funds that are allocated, bonds, flood plain management and an advisory committee.

The results of these issues are in Section 6: Membership: a smaller board was desired at that time. Boundaries would be set by each county. Black Lake was taken out of Thurston County; it is still unresolved about what is in Grays Harbor County in the basin. Members generally agreed on Roberts Rules of Order rather than a consensus. Public votes would be used for capital projects, funding plans and bond issuance. Regarding the flood plain management, there is a lot of concern about land use practices. FCS was asked to create potential rewards for those who do not develop in the flood plain and penalties for those who do. That is included in the financial analysis.

Section 7 refers to the draft ILA prepared in March. That was not continued.

Section 8 is the summary of the financial analysis. That was provided as a way to negotiate cost shares between the members and it needs a formula. FCS calculated a flood plain disincentive – the number is per acre per day. The report was edited to show that number as a maximum.

Section 9 is the bibliography.

Commissioner Averill thanked Mr. Ghilarducci and FCS for all the work that went into this difficult process. It is professional work and contains a lot of material that will have future value to the Flood Authority. An issue Commissioner Averill sees is the state's share of damages (about 35%). When we get to a point where we will create flood protection facilities, we need to address the state's share. He recognizes that the state is providing a large amount of money but the operations and maintenance and daily costs from year to year needs to be addressed as to the state's responsibility.

Commissioner Averill also stated that the memo did not break down the various costs to specific jurisdictions. How much of the \$340 million was in each county and each city? Mr. Ghilarducci stated some of that was summarized as fundamental conclusions. He believes he has that information. Commissioner Averill stated he would like to see it.

Commissioner Averill stated the Flood Authority is at a standstill as to how the organization proceeds. The capital budget legislation stipulates that between now and July whatever projects we set our sights on need cost and benefit ratios and time for when they will be addressed and we also need to identify the mechanisms to move on and share the costs. We need to address in the next 30 days how we proceed for the remainder of the year. To this point we have had state funding for ESA and now someone else will need to pick up that responsibility. Lewis County does not have a large enough planning staff and it can't pick up those costs. Lewis County is still the fiscal agent and will provide Ms. Anderson for record keeping but we need to talk to the governor's office about what can be used for administrative costs in the capital budget.

Chairman Raines stated that topic is on the agenda for the afternoon meeting.

Ms. Fund, Commissioner Willis and Ms. Powe all thanked Mr. Ghilarducci for his invaluable information. He was asked about providing CDs of his report and he said he would. He also stated he would provide hard copies for Commissioners Willis and Averill.

Ms. Fund stated the chart on page 2 only reflects findings from Lewis and Thurston County; there is no Grays Harbor County information. Mr. Ghilarducci stated FCS made assumptions to determine Grays Harbor County and there is not even a reference to Grays Harbor County. Mr. Ghilarducci stated the footnote can be more specific. He asked Commissioner Willis if that information was available.

Commissioner Willis stated damage was reported through some organization. The state had to have the information in order to declare an emergency.

Commissioner Averill stated the early estimates that the governor used are reported through Emergency Management Services. Mr. Ghilarducci stated he can offer a better explanation of what he did get and did not get and why. He also stated he was pleased to be able to work on this project.

4. Updates on Existing Projects

a. Update on Early Warning System, Potential Next Steps

Dr. David Curtis, West Consultants, presented a PowerPoint on the Early Warning System. The objectives of the system are a comprehensive web interface, data monitoring improvements and flood warning signage.

The website will include weather, rainfall and river forecasts, flood maps, gage data graphs and maps, Flood Authority news, road conditions, and USGS gages.

The maps include larger geographical areas and there are smaller maps that show neighborhoods for the most up-to-date information for any location.

The Early Warning System utilizes the GOES – Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellites – satellites which provide continuous monitoring data analysis. For the Chehalis Basin, GOES satellite imagery is used to estimate rainfall for flash flood warnings.

Commissioner Averill stated GOES came to Lewis County as the fiscal agent for the Flood Authority and it was approved last month. This could be a pilot model for a state-wide system. This is a system that the legislature asked for and it was done for the Chehalis Basin but there are two other river basins. The EMS people need it for the Cowlitz and Nisqually Basins. A jurisdiction operating an emergency management center can use this data. A problem for Lewis County and Centralia is that the emergency management centers only operate when an emergency arises.

Dr. Curtis stated the websites are multi-purpose and there are many reasons for people to access the information every day, such as for recreational purposes.

Commissioner Averill stated when this contract was let we did not think about ongoing operations and maintenance of the gages and there was no recommendation for it to the governor. The total for the Flood Authority is \$50,000 a year for maintenance; the amount would vary by county depending on the number of gages. We may have to ask the state if they can contribute to this. Currently all counties are using USGS gages for which they have agreements and they pay maintenance on those. He assumed the USGS gages do not include maintenance by West.

Commissioner Willis asked when West's contract runs out and what will they be able to accomplish by the end of that contract.

Dr. Curtis stated the contract ends on June 30, 2011 and everything will be done except the final installations of the Weyerhaeuser and DNR gages. The equipment has already been purchased and about \$15,000 in labor will not be billed by the 30th.

Mr. Swartout was concerned about technical maintenance on the telemetry devices. That needs to be figured out. Commissioner Averill asked if West could be contacted for maintenance contracts. Dr. Curtis stated that would be a possibility.

5. Break

The Chair recessed the meeting for a short break.

b. Update on Fisheries Study, Potential Next Steps

Mr. Bob Montgomery stated Anchor QEA has conducted field studies and employed water quality temperature probes in the Chehalis River throughout the Basin. The Chehalis Tribe knows where they are and how to access the data and those probes will always be there.

In-stream flow studies included 10 sites with cross section studies which gave a good characterization of habitat. An analysis of the hydrology and hydraulics showed what the flow out of the reservoir is expected to be for flood storage and for the multi-purpose facility. There will be estimates of what the flows will be on all parts of the river for an entire year.

Temperature impacts were looked at as well as sediment transport. All that work leads to what is called the fish population model, or Shiraz model. Anchor is under way with that modeling and has been compiling data since the beginning of the study. WDFW indicated there might be some missing data. Anchor will meet with them to see if anything was missed.

The Shiraz modeling needs to be completed and more meetings with the fish committee and the Flood Authority will continue for the rest of the year. Now that there is a time extension on Anchor's work it will be looking at what else can be done. Because of the compressed time for the fish study we did things backwards. We could look at those cross sections and re-do them for better habitat areas. We did not go into the reservoir site. There is an access agreement with Weyerhaeuser but we don't know the considerations. There is some information from seven years ago but we need more on when the fish are in the reservoir area.

Another issue is the sediment budget. A sediment transport study was done. With a sediment budget we could do cross sections of the river and re-survey some of those sections to see what changes are coming. That would help with the sediment analysis and tie in with flood work including the hydraulic model we use.

One consideration for fish is how resilient they are to changes in habitat and understanding water climate impacts will give us a better understanding of this. The House Bill has a provision to look at potential mitigation or fisheries impacts. Our study focused on potential impacts and benefits: what would be valuable. Instead of mitigating, try to enhance – try to get fisheries more robust and improve the numbers of fish in the basin.

Anchor is looking at expanding what it is doing and looking at potential enhancements in the basin. We thought about a two-step process: identify projects in the basin, such as culvert and habitat projects, and add main stem limiting factors and Skookumchuck limiting factors. Addressing those will comprehensively improve salmon population. It would fit into the fish study to see how improvements to habitat could improve fish population.

Commissioner Averill asked to reconvene the fish study committee. There is no budget and Anchor is looking at wrapping up the project. Part of the deliverables in the scope of work is Anchor must teach us the Shiraz and PHABSIM. We might want to think about who can be trained for that. In December we will do this again and the training must be addressed. The Weyerhaeuser access is a problem and we are trying to resolve that. They have data they can give to us.

Commissioner Averill stated Anchor is looking at two perspectives. One is a diversion dam: it would be closed and hold water during an event and release it over a period of time and access for fish would still

be there. The other is a multi-purpose dam: water quality improvement to release water during the summer or for hydro. That is how the data is currently being collected. The improvement and enhancement would be very valuable to us. Our river system has 350 tributaries with a dam on the Wynoochee and one on the Skookumchuck. A question to consider is if the dam causes problems can it be mitigated elsewhere and improved.

Ms. Powe asked if there is information lacking in the studies. Mr. Montgomery stated he did not think so. Ms. Powe stated she thinks flow augmentation is a good idea – keep the current going. She asked if this can be done with the same budget. Mr. Montgomery stated no. It can be within the same time frame but not the same budget. There would be an additional \$200,000 needed.

Mr. Montgomery stated Anchor's scope of work would not add more species. WDFW identified different life stages than what Anchor had heard. Anchor needs to find out if WDFW's data can be used and if not are there studies Anchor could do this summer to determine if WDFW is correct and how to incorporate that.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated if we think about Anchor doing additional work regarding enhancement it is not effective to look at just anadromous fish.

Ms. Fund stated we need to drill down. With the budget we have this is what we want Anchor to do. Mr. Schlenger stated at the meeting that anadromous salmon will relate to the other fish species.

6. Final Progress Report from ESA

Chairman Raines thanked Mr. Mackey and Mr. Easton for all of their work.

Mr. Mackey stated ESA has been proud to be involved with the Flood Authority and believed a lot of good work was done. He stated Ann Root did a lot of excellent work. He stated his last day in the office will be Wednesday, June 22. The office will close and Spencer will be going to Seattle.

Ms. Fund asked if the Flood Authority has copies of all documents. Mr. Mackey stated all documents are either on the website or in PDF form.

7. Moving Forward

a. Budget Requirements

Chairman Raines presented a PowerPoint of a draft work plan. She stated the goals can be added to or modified.

Chairman Raines stated the Flood Authority needs to do its homework and provide what the legislature has asked for and give them recommendations. They will determine what eventually goes forward.

Chairman Raines stated she needs to talk to Mr. Phillips about how to proceed. Previously there was money used for consultants and now we need direction from the state for staffing and consultants.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked, regarding the committees, if it would always be Flood Authority members or could members designate other people. Chairman Raines stated Mr. Swartout could be assigned or a public information officer.

Commissioner Averill spoke to the issue with the legislature in House Bill 2020. It refers to the Twin Cities project. That project is separate from the Flood Authority basin-wide projects and operates out of the governor's office. The Flood Authority's contract for the Twin Cities project is through the Corps and John Donahue. The \$50 million from 2008 to support both the Twin Cities project and to get started with the basin-wide is referenced here. A certain amount of that money is reserved for the Corps project: \$1.2 million. Another problem is we will learn the funding for the Corps project has not been resolved. The last funding was for fiscal year 2010. The 2011 funding disappeared when there were no earmarks. The Corps has been working on money appropriated in 2009-2010. We have a bill being considered by congress but in the last 8 years they have never completed a bill by September 30. The Corps has no estimation that they will get additional money to work on the Twin cities project in the 2011 fiscal year.

Ms. Powe asked if the committees Chairman Raines proposed will allow other members to attend and can the public attend. Ms. Raines stated there will be no voting and she would prefer no more than four to a group. A representative could be sent. Unless there is a legal opinion she does not see an issue. She stated Ms. Powe would be welcome to attend.

Commissioner Willis asked if the workshop meetings with the committees would be open to the public. Chairman Raines stated yes.

8. Public Comment

Mr. Vince Panesko stated there has not been a sediment study done on the river and it is important to do a sediment budget. The amount of sediment that is moved in the winter is huge. Regarding the fish study, there is no sediment budget and old cross sections are being used. Over the last few years the state has been taking measurements for fish. There are a lot of sand and gravel bars which create good spawning areas. Fish experts have been on his property and the state has a lot of data. He did not hear that Anchor used state data.

Chairman Raines stated the Flood Authority would take comments to Anchor in a few weeks. There was an extensive meeting on June 15 and Mr. Montgomery only gave about a ten-minute overview of that meeting.

9. Adjourn

There was no other business and the meeting adjourned at 11:49 a.m.

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

**June 16, 2011
Meeting Notes**

Board Members Present: Vickie Raines, City of Montesano; Ron Averill, Lewis County; Jim Cook, City of Aberdeen; Dolores Lee, Town of Pe Ell; Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County; Andrea Fowler, Town of Bucoda; Julie Balmelli-Powe, City of Chehalis; Edna Fund, City of Centralia; Dan Thompson, City of Oakville; Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County
Others Present: Please see sign in sheet

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from May 19, 2011

1. Call to Order

Chairman Raines called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.

2. Introductions

Self-introductions were made by all attending.

3. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion carried.

4. Approval of Meeting Notes

A motion was made and seconded to approve the meeting notes. The motion carried. The motion was to approve both the work shop and the business meeting notes.

5. Public Comment

Mr. Vince Panesko stated HB 2020 allows money for the hydraulic model on the lower river and to finish the fish study. He stated there are two more studies that need to be done. The Shannon and Wilson report said there were no fatal flaws that could not be addressed through engineering. That means an ancient land slide must be moved and there is no cost in the report to remove that. The Shannon and Wilson report also stated that the fatal flaw statement continued with "if confirmed by geotechnical studies." The geotechnical studies have not been done, so there could be fatal flaws.

Another item to be addressed in terms of additional costs in building the dam is the statement about the existing costs of materials. The assumption was the cost of the materials of the dam would come from the vicinity of the reservoir. He stated there are no rocks in the vicinity of Pe Ell that qualify for a dam. Very hard basalt is needed and someone needs to do a study to find out where hard rock is available and calculate that cost into this.

6. Reports

a. Chair's Report

Chairman Raines stated the challenge before the Flood Authority is how to address the flooding issues in the river basin. The legislature has given everyone in the basin a long list of items to accomplish which were discussed at the morning meeting. We also talked about how to accomplish the work by breaking the workload up into work committees. Those will be discussed later today.

Chairman Raines would like to find a way to work together to find solutions in the basin.

b. Member Reports

Chairman Raines asked each of the Flood Authority members to report on projects under way in each of their communities.

Commissioner Averill stated there are several projects in Lewis County. One is the current project to widen the freeway from Maytown to Blakeslee Junction with new interchanges at the Harrison and Mellen St. exits. This project is scheduled to start in July 2012 and when completed will provide uninterrupted access to the hospital. Part of that project will consist of extending an existing dike to prevent water from going under the freeway.

The Twin Cities project relates to part of the improvements that will have to be made in a major flood mitigation effort. The Corps provides updates on that project. What might happen if congress does not continue appropriation for that project is we will have to stop further progress until money is made available.

The County has had a long-standing project in the Adna area and that is the Willapa Trail from Chehalis to Raymond. It was once a railroad and the berm for the railroad acted like a dike but maintenance has not been done and the water was redirected into Adna. The County and the Corps have looked at that berm but funding is a problem.

Mr. Cook stated Aberdeen's projects have been ongoing for a number of years: rebuilding the tide gates, installing new pump stations in three locations; fill was removed from Franklin Field to create a holding area and a new pump station was installed there.

Ms. Fowler stated Bucoda is working on getting the siren replaced and maintaining the levee on the north end of town, and working with Burlington Northern to improve river flow underneath the tracks.

Ms. Powe stated Chehalis is working on wetland restoration areas to alleviate flooding and to mitigate for other projects. Chehalis is also talking to the Corps regarding Dillenbaugh Creek which is a major component of Chehalis' flooding. They hope to work on a solution to re-route the creek to keep it from going through the city.

Mr. Thompson stated Oakville is still in collaboration with the Tribe and Grays Harbor County for a culvert replacement.

Ms. Fund stated Centralia is working with DOT on the I-5 project; the city manager is working on the FEMA work group with other entities; there is a stream team working to clean out the trash in China Creek; Centralia is continuing to raise houses.

Commissioner Willis stated Grays Harbor County is supporting agriculture through the Right to Farm Ordinance which is being formed at this time. A component of that is keeping those areas clear for

flooding activity when needed. There is also work being done on the Community Rating System (CRS) which will help keep flood insurance down; early warning system training for tsunamis; Grays Harbor County also has a stream team that is working on restoring streams; stream gages are being supported and Grays Harbor County is the local sponsor for the GI ecosystem and hydraulic modeling is being done on that. They are doing what is called the Clear Process in the building department to go through the critical areas process before someone starts to build, particularly in a frequently flooded area.

c. Correspondence

Chairman Raines stated a letter was received from the City of Aberdeen Public Works director that talked about a planning manual that is being developed by DOE and also about issues of the rising sea level.

A letter was received from Ms. Chris Hempleman relating to the Chehalis River water retention Phase 2B study.

An e-mail from Chairman Raines to the legislators, and a reply from Hans Dunshee are on file.

A letter was submitted from Duane Tonn from the City of Montesano regarding solutions to flooding issues in the Chehalis Basin.

Chairman Raines stated all correspondence is available upon request.

d. State Team Report

Mr. John Donahue reported that he and Ms. Hempleman participated in the Board Advisory Committee (BAC) this month. Mr. Donahue was invited by Ms. Pam Peiper to a briefing with the Corps of Engineers on federal projects. Ms. Peiper is a field representative for Congresswoman Herrera-Beutler.

Mr. Donahue has been informed that due to the uncertainty of the federal budget that the Corps has been directed to develop options as to how to wrap up both of the federal projects by September 30. He anticipates the proposal within the next couple of days and Mr. Donahue will be meeting with Mr. Phillips on Monday and that the proposal will be reviewed, as well as HB 2020 and its impact on state agencies.

e. Corps of Engineers Report

i. Twin Cities Report

Mr. Goss stated the Corps is coordinating some time elevations for 100-year levees with DOT on the Skookumchuck Dam, modeling projects for levees and dams and levees only; looking at incremental benefits for modifications to the Skookumchuck Dam. The Corps has initial water levels for a 100-year event and a few iterations will be done on those. Design levels on levees for 100-year protection are being done. Some areas where levee heights have been increased and where there is no set-back the levees may require some re-design because of space limitations. If the levees are higher they also need to be wider.

The Corps is continuing its re-evaluation of the environmental mitigation wetlands classification.

The hydraulics engineering center reviewed the structure data base and hydraulic modeling used for the benefit/cost ratio. Initial comments have been received and they are being addressed. A new preliminary benefit/cost ratio should be completed in a month.

The funding situation for 2012 is still unknown and the Corps' fiscal year ends September 30. There is nothing in the president's budget for these projects. If there is some type of delay in funding, documents and studies are organized so when things pick up everything is in order and work can start up again.

As Mr. Donahue stated, the meeting with Ms. Peiper was to go over background information on the Twin Cities project and the GI.

ii. Basin-Wide General Investigation

Mr. Goss stated there is a modeling scope of work, which is pending award. The Corps has been talking to the local sponsor, Grays Harbor County. This project was scoped in the Project Management Plan (PMP) and there have been some reviews by DOE. This is a single purpose GI – ecosystem only – whether it is a single purpose or if flood risk management gets added at a later date, this step of this process has to go. It is without project hydraulic modeling. We are going to model the basin to see what it looks like now and then if flood projects come in the flood goes into the model and we run the model with the projects and see how they are affected. Although this project is single purpose the hydraulic modeling is for the ecosystem and the information can be used for a dual purpose also. Funding for this project for 2012 is unknown so there may be some delay in the work.

Commissioner Averill stated the governor's bill has money set aside for a hydrology project, which is about \$400,000. There is money in the current GI budget to do it so he does not understand why there would be a delay. If we use the money in the governor's budget, Commissioner Averill will do whatever he can do to ensure it includes flood mitigation because the Corps is using state money that was set aside for the Flood Authority to do flood mitigation – if we are the match.

Mr. Goss stated under the current GI there is no flood risk management. Commissioner Averill stated if the Corps is using the Flood Authority's money, he will object to the Corps doing the basin-wide project. The GI money that is there, if you are using it under the PMP with Grays Harbor County, is only for ecosystem restoration, although you might want to look at the project because there is a flood mitigation element in it.

Commissioner Averill stated from his point of view, he wants the data that we had for the hydrology study to reflect what we already have in the upper basin. If the Corps' study won't do that, then the State should go to someone else to do it.

Mr. Goss stated the modeling is for hydraulic modeling which will be used for either ecosystem or ecosystem and flood risk management. It is not a savings account that will carry over. It's either use it by the end of the fiscal year or it's gone; other funds that are in the GI have been rescinded on other programs and projects in the Seattle district. If it is not allocated against a contract the money will be rescinded.

Commissioner Averill stated at the last meeting he asked Mr. Goss to provide an accounting of where the left-over money went – between \$12,000 and \$48,000. There was \$1.2 million appropriated to do a basin-wide study. It was hoped that the Flood Authority would get together with the Chehalis Basin Partnership and the study would not only include ecosystem restoration but also flood mitigation. Commissioner Averill understands we did not get there – there was some shock when the Corps came to the Flood Authority with a project that would take 14 years and cost \$24 million. Looking at that, we

backed off and did not obligate any money. Nevertheless, the money is being spent. The Flood Authority has not had a voice in it because there is no PMP.

Commissioner Averill stated in 2010 \$265,000 was spent in house, \$305,000 to a contract with USGS to do a hydrology study of the Basin and install two stream gages. That is the information that was provided by Mr. Goss.

Mr. Goss stated there was hydrologic modeling and stream gauges. Commissioner Averill stated the Flood Authority was not involved with that. Mr. Goss stated that task is in the PMP.

Commissioner Averill stated Mr. Goss said the PMP is with Grays Harbor and not with the Chehalis Basin Partnership. He was under the impression that Grays Harbor was acting as the fiscal agent for the Chehalis Basin Partnership in the expenditures of money on the ecosystem restoration.

Commissioner Averill asked if a hydraulic study has already been done, why do we need another one, and can we see it? He was referring to the USGS study for \$305,000 for fiscal year 2010. Mr. Goss stated that was for rainfall surface water. This one is for the hydraulics of the river – they are different studies. USGS will be providing a final report on that and with their process it may be another six months to a year before it is available. It will be public domain and if the Corps is asked to provide a copy of it, they will.

Commissioner Averill stated in fiscal year 2011 the Corps spent internally another \$105,000 and \$53,000 on a UW study which he would like to have. The UW study referenced previous studies done in the basin and an abstract of each study.

Mr. Goss stated that is in preparation and \$15,000 to \$20,000 was for that study and the study will be available when it is completed; the other \$30,000 will need to be un-obligated from the contract and go back into the balance of available funds for Chehalis.

Commissioner Willis spoke to the hydraulic modeling. Mr. Goss talked about the modeling being done in the upper basin already and Commissioner Willis asked if the modeling in the lower basin would be at the same level as far as the technical merit. Mr. Goss stated yes, and what isn't covered by Twin Cities, there may be some modeling included in the upper and lower basin in that study.

Commissioner Willis stated there was money from the legislation to spend on modeling, and she asked if modeling could not be enhanced outside the Corps' arena. Could the Corps coordinate to bring it up to a different level?

Mr. Goss stated more detail could be added in – it can be built upon, yes. The Corps' current contract could be modified to add that on or if another agency wanted to work with another consultant once the model is done, that would be available. Mr. Goss is intending to use West Consultants for the lower basin.

Ms. Powe asked what the time frame would be for the modeling. Mr. Goss stated about a year.

7. Discussion of Draft Work Plan

Chairman Raines stated the draft work plan was discussed at the morning session, which included the goals for the Flood Authority and some key dates. She summarized the discussion for the benefit of those Board members who had not attended the morning session.

Chairman Raines asked if there was any discussion.

Commissioner Averill spoke to the upper basin members. Neither Centralia nor Chehalis are on the upper basin committee and when we talk about big projects in the basin, at least one of those entities should be represented.

Chairman Raines stated there are four jurisdictions represented on each committee. She was trying not to get it to a quorum. They will be open meetings; anyone can attend. She expected that the assigned members would bring back recommendations to the Flood Authority as a whole.

Commissioner Averill thought perhaps the group should get together in the upper basin to decide who they think is best to represent them.

Commissioner Willis stated the work plan has a set of goals and she asked how they were brought forward. Chairman Raines stated these goals were drawn from prior meetings and prior comments as well as issues that have been discussed over the last couple of meetings as to where we would like to go. Holding the meetings in various jurisdictions would allow participation by the public. The draft work plan is a starting point for the Flood Authority to come together as a team and be able to get some things accomplished on behalf of our citizenry.

Commissioner Willis asked how the beginning and ending flood dates were determined. Many times the flood season varies. Chairman Raines stated this is a draft document.

Commissioner Willis asked about the process that we might go through for the various committees. Advertising was mentioned – where would these be advertised and who would put the agendas together? Chairman Raines thought the committees should get together and select a chair. For example, the lower basin teams should meet in the lower basin and they can decide where they would meet. The meetings should be posted so the other Flood Authority members are made aware of the meetings. She thought the Daily World and the Chronicle could get something in the papers.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked for clarification on the website: where it will be located and who will maintain it. Chairman Raines stated it would be under the community outreach and public information and Ms. Anderson maintains the website on the Lewis County site.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked if that would be the website and would it continue to be used with Ms. Anderson maintaining it. Chairman Raines stated no, that is currently what is being done and it can continue to be used that way if that is the recommendation to the Flood Authority. If not, the suggestion was to include the integration of the Early Warning System.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked who is staffing the meetings and getting everyone together, taking minutes, posting minutes and doing follow up. Chairman Raines stated that needs to be discussed. If the committee set-up needs to be postponed until the next meeting, Chairman Raines was okay with that. Staffing also needs to be discussed with Mr. Phillips and he will not be back in his office until Monday.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked if the Board Advisory Committee would continue. Chairman Raines stated that still needs to be determined and that is another discussion for Mr. Phillips.

Commissioner Valenzuela thought it might be a good idea to postpone decisions on the committees. She did like the idea of the Flood Authority operating in sub-committees as long as they are appropriately staffed. There is a question of expenses being reimbursed, etc.

Ms. Fund stated the sub-committees will enable things getting done between regular meetings, and everyone can comment on various topics when they come back to the Flood Authority. She was pleased with what Chairman Raines proposed.

Ms. Powe stated staffing is a huge issue. She thought it would be best to wait for Mr. Phillips to return. She made a motion that staffing issues be handled at the next meeting. Ms. Lee seconded.

There was discussion to clarify the motion. Chairman Raines stated Item 8, approval of committee designations, would be withdrawn. The motion was to postpone any discussion about staffing of the committees until Chairman Raines could have a discussion with Mr. Phillips.

There was no more discussion and the motion passed.

8. Approve Committee Designations

Withdrawn

9. Next Steps for Early Warning System

Chairman Raines stated the Early Warning System is state of the art and is being watched closely by others in Washington and along the West Coast. The Flood Authority wants to ensure that the system is designed and implemented. The next steps include how it can be implemented, operated and maintained.

Commissioner Averill stated West Consultant's contract was principally to study how we might improve the system and subsequently provide improvements up and down the basin. The Emergency Management System in Washington works somewhat disconnectedly. There is a state Emergency Operations Center (EOC) that watches what is going on around the state but the county and city EOCs operate on their own. With the system in place on the Chehalis Basin, if the water starts in the upper basin and flows to the bay it is dependent on each center to pass the word along. West's system will give us near real-time reporting data that each EOC and citizens will be able to see at the same time.

We now have a system that consists of some new gages that are spread throughout the basin, a computer system that will be at each EOC and the information will be available on the internet. The cost involved will be about \$50,000 a year for operations and maintenance. Our contract does not provide the money for that; the legislation in the capital budget has \$1.32 million for expenditures by the Flood Authority and/or a local agency. It has many other stipulations in it which much be discussed with the governor.

Commissioner Averill made a motion that we ask the state to pick up the first year's expenditures. We can then determine how we can pick it up ourselves: will we have an organization that handles the money and pays the bills or does each jurisdiction pay its share?

Mr. Cook seconded the motion.

Ms. Lee asked if this would come out of the funding that was allocated to the Flood Authority or will it be subject to additional funding.

Chairman Raines stated her understanding was that the state would be asked to add it in, so it would be additional.

Commissioner Willis asked for clarification to Ms. Lee's question: additional funds to what is in the Bill itself? Will we ask for something other than what was allocated in this budget for the early warning system? Ms. Lee stated that was her understanding.

Commissioner Willis asked when we talk about going to the governor's office, are we actually presenting something to OFM for them to approve? According to the language she read, OFM must approve the expenditures that come to the Flood Authority.

Commissioner Averill stated we always have. The Flood Authority usually does a contract and as the fiscal agent, Lewis County goes to OFM to make sure the contract meets their requirements. As expenditures take place Lewis County gets the bills and notifies OFM and they provide the money to pay the bills. He pointed out that the Flood Authority will not be able to ask the governor for any more money than the \$1.32 million that is already there. But we do not know for what the \$1.32 million is allocated. There is about \$650,000 that was originally intended for administrative expenses for the Flood Authority and to extend the FCS study. He is not sure either of those will take place so there might be some room to move money around.

Ms. Lee stated in that case the answer to her question would be no. Commissioner Willis stated we would allocate part of the \$1.32 million towards the Early Warning System. She added a friendly amendment that if it reads that way there will be a better opportunity for it to be approved.

Chairman Raines restated the motion: that \$50,000 for the implementation of operations and maintenance to come from the funding allocation set by the OFM. She asked if that was correct. There was no other discussion. The motion carried.

10. Extension of Fisheries Study

Chairman Raines stated this morning there was discussion about extending the Fish Study to December 25, 2011. She entertained a motion to do so. Ms. Lee made the motion; Commissioner Valenzuela seconded.

Commissioner Willis asked if there was a scope of work for the extension. She was told there was not and she stated that the Flood Authority should determine the scope of work and then decide whether or not to move forward. She stated she was uncomfortable with approving the extension without knowing the scope of work. At the fish meeting there were several suggestions of what needed to be done next and she said there was not a clear picture of what that would be. She stated if the motion is to extend the fisheries study with a mechanism afterwards to determine the scope of work she would be comfortable with that.

Ms. Lee asked if a scope of work could be completed by the next meeting.

Commissioner Averill stated he did not think this was out of order. This is just the opportunity to extend the fisheries study to December. Does the Flood Authority want to pursue that study? He thinks the answer is yes. The next step is to develop the scope of work. When we first decided to do a fisheries study we did not do the scope of work first. The sub-committee sat down and worked that out and came back with the scope of work for Anchor QEA to follow. The scope of work does have some modifications as we advance towards December. We need to sit down with the contractor to define the scope of work. That should be able to be done within 30 days.

Ms. Fund clarified that Item 10 is only extending the date of the fish study because the current contract ends on June 30. Chairman Raines stated that is correct.

Chairman Raines stated the motion is to extend the Fisheries Study to December 25, 2011, made by Ms. Lee, seconded by Commissioner Valenzuela. There was no other discussion and the motion carried.

11. Authorize Development of Scope of Work for Fisheries Enhancement Study

Chairman Raines stated when Mr. Phillips attended the May meeting he mentioned the need for mitigation for any potential impacts of upstream storage, and HB 2020 specifically states that mitigation will be one item addressed in the report. Chairman Raines believes Anchor is willing to undertake that effort and it would cost about \$22,000. (Mr. Muller's comment was inaudible).

Chairman Raines asked what direction Anchor should go on its scope of work. She asked Commissioner Willis if she did not want the scope changed.

Commissioner Willis stated a couple things were decided: we would go forward with the same scope of work but extending the date; if the scope is going to be enhanced, she does not want to approve something unknown. Are we going to approve the enhancement and create and approve the scope of work at a different time?

Chairman Raines stated her notes showed \$22,000 for the initial review of fisheries enhancement opportunities for the month of June that we have funds available for and will ultimately lose, and also develop an overall scope of work.

Ms. Lee stated we already have a scope of work to complete and she asked if we would ask them to come back and tell us what they want to do in the enhancement. Chairman Raines stated it would be a supplemental contract.

Ms. Lee made a motion that the Flood Authority asks Anchor to define the enhancement and then approve it. Chairman Raines stated that would cost us for the remainder of June. She asked if Ms. Lee was okay with that. Ms. Lee stated we have the money to pay them through June for the existing contract. If the scope of work is going to change in any way it will cost more money. We need to be aware of that before we vote on it.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated the original scope of work was worked out between Anchor and the Fish Committee. She moved to authorize development of the scope of work for the fisheries enhancement study to the Fish Committee and with Anchor QEA. Commissioner Willis seconded.

Mr. Cook stated Mr. White was on the original committee. He asked who of the original committee was still available.

Commissioner Averill stated when the fish study was done it was under stipulations from the 2010 capital budget. One stipulation was who would take part in that project and the Tribe was one, whether or not they are a member of this group.

Mr. Mackey stated the legislation for 2010 specified there would be a sub-committee of the Flood Authority and those members were Commissioners Averill, Valenzuela, and Willis and Ms. Fund, representing Centralia, and they were to work in consultation with three groups: Fish and Wildlife, PUD and the Tribe. The four members actually constitute the sub-committee.

Ms. Powe thought the Flood Authority should authorize the development of the scope of work now because we only have until next June to get this done. As Mr. Muller stated this morning we have to have the fisheries study done before the PUD can move on to the benefit cost ratio that needs to go to the state by the end of this fiscal year. Everyone at the table wanted a fish study, including the Tribe.

Chairman Raines stated the motion is to move forward with the fisheries study with the fish sub-committee.

Commissioner Willis asked if Ms. Powe was opposed to that motion because she did not want to take it back to the sub-committee. If that is correct, then Commissioner Willis needs to understand what the enhancement study is.

Ms. Powe stated she was opposed to the motion based on the essence of time. The state has directed the Flood Authority to look at mitigation in the fish study and Mr. Montgomery stated this morning instead of just mitigating, why not look at enhancing the basin for fish habitat. She is not opposed to the sub-committee; she is opposed to the time it will take. Last year the fish study kept being put off and there was only 9 months to complete the study.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated she did not think it would be wise to move forward with an enhancement study without some of the concerns heard at the fish sub-committee meeting yesterday being part of the discussion about the parameters for this further work. The sub-committee can do that quickly and wants to be involved in what that enhancement is. She did agree with Ms. Powe that there is an urgency to move this forward.

Ms. Powe believed this could be authorized today and the sub-committee and Anchor could go forward from today knowing that it will happen. Waiting for the sub-committee to convene will put off the action item until next month. We are only authorizing the development of the scope.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated that was the motion that was made: the Flood Authority should authorize the fish sub-committee to move forward with Anchor QEA with defining the enhancement portion of the study.

Commissioner Averill stated when we develop a new scope of work we will also develop a new contract. That lies with Lewis County. All the preparatory work can be done by the next meeting, allowing Anchor the time that it needs to get done. All we are doing at this time is authorizing the fish group to sit down

with Anchor to work out the scope. That scope will be brought back to the Flood Authority and we will formalize it.

Mr. Johnson stated in anticipation of the fish committee getting the scope, he can start a contract. The problem is the Flood Authority does not meet until next month and he is preparing a contract for the Board of County Commissioners to sign as the fiscal agent and there cannot be any changes to the scope once it is prepared by the fish committee. The authorization of the fish committee to do this needs to be narrowly defined but also inclusive enough so when it comes back it is basically a rubber stamp of what they are approving; otherwise there will be more delays.

Chairman Raines restated the motion: to authorize the development of the scope of work for the fisheries enhancement study by the fish sub-committee and Anchor QEA.

Ms. Powe asked if a timeframe can be added so the scope can be approved next month. Chairman Raines asked if the timeframe should be the July meeting.

Commissioner Averill stated if there is a contract in place and it is approved by the Flood Authority at the July meeting, the next week the County will approve the contract.

The Chair added the date of the July meeting to the motion. The motion carried.

Ms. Fund asked who will arrange the meeting since ESA will no longer be doing that. It was determined that Commissioner Averill would arrange the meeting.

12. Authorize Development of Scope of Work for Hydraulic Modeling Study

Chairman Raines stated the legislature authorized the hydraulic modeling in the remainder of the basin and the Corps is proposing to do some of the modeling as part of the basin-wide GI. The Flood Authority needs to develop a scope of work to begin the process of the hydraulic modeling as a whole. She entertained a motion to develop a scope of work for the hydraulic modeling.

Commissioner Averill moved that the Flood Authority authorize a development of a scope of work for hydraulic modeling of the lower basin of the Chehalis River. He suggested some people be assigned to this because there is some concern of where the Corps is going with its hydraulic modeling and whether it is consistent with the modeling that has already been done in the upper basin. There should be representatives from both the upper and lower basin.

Chairman Raines asked if Commissioners Willis and Valenzuela would like to be involved with that. Commissioner Willis stated she would. She suggested Commissioner Averill put that together.

Chairman Raines asked if there was a second to Commissioner Averill's motion. Ms. Lee seconded. There was no further discussion. The motion carried.

13. Authorize Development and Circulation of RFQ for Public Outreach and Website Development by Outreach Committee

Chairman Raines suggested waiting on this since the sub committees were not approved. It will go on the agenda for next month.

14. Expenditure Review

Mr. Bob Johnson briefly went through the expenditures for the period of May 16 through June 14, 2011. The total expenditure for the period was \$133,318.95. There is an unencumbered balance but it will be gone by the end of the month. As discussed earlier, Lewis County as the fiscal agent will need to negotiate the contract with OFM. Even though the budget proviso did not stipulate administrative costs last year they were allowed. He anticipates that those kinds of obligations and expenditures would be included in this budget as well.

15. Confirm Next Meeting and Board-Requested Topics

Chairman Raines stated the July meeting will be in Chehalis and there can be future discussions about rotating the meeting place. Some items for the agenda will be discussions with the governor's office regarding staffing. Any suggestions or comments about the work plan and the next steps and goals can be emailed to Chairman Raines.

Chairman Raines stated a morning session will be scheduled to go over the staffing of committees and receive a more detailed report from Anchor QEA. Following that meeting a brief summary will be provided to the legislature with the quarter to ending summary.

Commissioner Averill stated Lewis County will make the arrangements for the morning session. If there is a conflict with the Museum, he will advise the Flood Authority of the location.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated she appreciated the idea of moving the meetings around to make them more conducive to public participation. Thurston County's invitation to use the courthouse is open and she urged a meeting to be held in Grays Harbor County. Commissioner Willis stated she would find out about the availability of Montesano City Hall or another location when there is a schedule.

16. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.