

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

**June 18, 2009 – 9:00 A.M.
Meeting Notes**

1. Convene Work Session

Chairman Averill called meeting to order at 9:10 A.M.

2. Introductions

Self-introductions were made by all attending.

Chairman Averill introduced Bruce Mackey, the new project manager for ESA Adolfson. Mr. Mackey has a PhD in Agribusiness and has managed farm lands and timberlands. He has worked with communities all his life on natural resources projects and is very interested in this area. He thanked Linda Hoffman for all the work she has done stepping into this situation.

Chairman Averill stated Linda has been interim project manager and is passing the baton on to Bruce. She will continue to work through the end of the month and will be on call after that. Linda was originally part of the government relations team and has been helpful there, but filling in has been extra duty for her. She will continue to work in government relations.

Dave Carlton wished to express his thanks to Linda, also.

3. Summary of Check-in Conversations

Ms. Hoffman talked with each board member in May. It has been one year since the Flood Authority was formed and the consultants wanted to find out how the board members felt things were going. The results of the conversations were summarized in a memo in the packets and this summary and her thoughts were recapped in a PowerPoint.

Recommendations:

- Take action as soon as possible to reduce flood damage to people, property and the basin as a whole.
- Schedule sufficient time and the right time to communicate, discuss, consider and decide. Consider rescheduling work session times so all can attend.
- Pay attention to decision processes and building support for action both inside (with members) and outside the Flood Authority.
- Set the Flood Authority up for long term success in Plan implementation by establishing institutions and mechanisms for governance, funding and operations.

She thanked the authority for sharing thoughts with her and she welcomed comments that were shared with her during conversations.

Commissioner Valenzuela thought the recap was very well done. There are differences between ordinary citizen and the focus of the elected officials. She attended the meeting at Swede Hall that was hosted by One Voice. People are looking to us for relief in the short term and we are talking about the slow wheels of government. One point that was stressed at that meeting: Educate the public. We need to talk to people about what can realistically be expected. Commissioner Valenzuela is personally concerned about people in South Thurston County if some of the projects come to fruition. What happens in Lewis County does not stay in Lewis County. She is in a quandary about providing people in Thurston County with as much relief as possible as we head into another flood season.

Mayor Schillinger thanked Dave, Linda and Spencer. It is his opinion that we have made tremendous strides, especially coming from separate governments and perspectives. There has been good progress on specific projects and it has been facilitated very well. As far as fast fixes, we knew going in there would not be a quick fix. Anyone living on the river knows that.

Commissioner Willis agreed with Commissioner Valenzuela that we need an education piece about what can realistically be done. There is a list of short projects that would be helpful. She likes critter pads which could help a land owner. People would need grade and fill permit, fences and gates and there are some projects we can do right away. Warning systems and education are something that can be done right away. We do have some quick fixes to put into place.

The Chair thanked everyone for their comments and finds the study right on target. There will be recommendations this afternoon and we are moving forward. Adequate public education is necessary. They may not like the message but they need to know what we are doing. Documentation of what we have accomplished is significant. We are trying to figure out what is the best for the most people.

4. Adna Levee Project

During the 2007 flood Adna took a big hit from flood waters. The way the flood developed, the dams built up and forced water into areas where it had never been before. In Adna the water was redirected and forced up into the Bunker Creek area and during that process a number of homes were flooded on the Bunker Creek Rd. as well as the Adna school. It took out the Boistfort water system which was out for six months. They asked the Corps to look at what happened and what could be done and at the meeting a couple of weeks ago the Corps reported the results of their study.

There are three potential solutions that might be done for Adna: 1 – Make a levee out of the Willapa Trail. 2 – Widening out and channeling the river. 3 – Provide some areas where some water might be captured to hold back during a flood event and then release it subsequent to the event. We do not know if this was a unique event, if it will ever happen again. The stumbling block is because the berm (The Willapa Trail) is in a Rails to Trails bank. Typically when you build a levee, the Corp wants the levee to belong to a

government jurisdiction. Because this property reverts to the railroad there is a question as to whether this can be done. There is a program that the Corps has that comes under section 205 which provides for a state and local share, such as we are studying with the Twin Cities Project. There must be a 50/50 share for the study phase and when you develop a mitigation project it is 65/35 share. Before the Corps can do anything, we must establish who can provide the non federal share for the study. It could be 2011 before we start a study. The Corps is suggesting the Corps be allowed within its budgetary constraints to start investigating a project with \$100,000 of their own money before the money is found from other sources. They could do preliminary studies but we would need funding after that. Since we are going to be doing a GI study of the Basin perhaps we can put that project into it and allow the Corps to start looking at the feasibility of that project and the best solutions.

There are a lot of questions to be answered and Chairman Averill promised to keep the citizens of Adna informed. He suggested turning this issue over to the BAC to look at avenues and to make some recommendations back to the Flood Authority as to whether we should pick up this project or not.

Commissioner Willis asked if this is a project that was discussed last year or something we are just now introducing to the Flood Authority.

Chairman Averill stated it is on the list for local projects.

Ms. Hoffman stated the Adna project had some initial Corps study done last summer and it has been discussed as one of the local capital projects and if it went through the Flood Authority prioritization the Flood Authority could support one of the jurisdictions taking the sponsorship, or matching funds, but you have yet to make decisions on the local projects.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated it is based on the 2007 flood. What did not get introduced is the anatomy of the two flood events of 2007 and 2009. They were so different and we did not take those into consideration. It may make a difference in arriving at reasonable solutions. We need to distinguish between those two very different flood events and which one we are reacting to.

Chairman Averill stated the citizens of Adna got damage from both floods and there is still overlap.

Mr. White asked if the Corps can bring to the table how this project would impact other projects.

Chairman Averill stated they did not discuss that. There will be a lot of water retention in the prime channel of the river and it will push water upstream. As we move forward, that question should be considered.

Mr. White asked how many people this would affect.

Chairman Averill stated a Section 205 must be under 7 million; where we are in the range we won't know until we do the second phase study. It is an unincorporated community, possibly 300 homes. The Corps did provide an initial study but at this meeting they said they would need to look at other alternatives to explore what they can and cannot do.

Mr. MacReynolds asked if the Corps would do a cost benefit analysis.

Chairman Averill stated yes, they would.

Question: Where would we find paperwork on the Phase I portion? Chairman Averill stated he would check on that.

Ms. Hoffman stated this is one of several local projects. The Flood Authority has not yet weighed in on one or another of these. We have a process to recommend for doing that and you will need information to support that.

Commissioner Willis stated this is a good example of how to build the process.

Chairman Averill stated the Corps came into Adna and starting to talk to them at the request of Senator Swecker. They had not talked to the County and there is no City of Adna.

Commissioner Willis stated we realize that if you do anything in the flood plain you take up the water space but you also put something in the way that diverts the water that can be just as harmful. We are carefully looking at where we are diverting the water to and that is the reason for this discussion. We don't want to create something to discover damage somewhere else.

Ms. Julie Powe stated the damaged area of Adna was larger than the 300 people. All the water went through the dairies. It could not have gone through a worst place. One dairy lost all its cows.

5. Early Warning System

Chairman Averill stated he is a great advocate of an early warning system. The 2007 and the 2009 events have different characteristics but one characteristics that drives the point home is in 2007 we had little notification to get people prepared. It had been 12 years since the previous event and preparation was at a low ebb. In 2009 we had 5 days of advance notice. People were able to get product up off the floor, sandbags were out early. We were prepared to move animals if need be. Fortunately, we did not get a quick break of water; it was more gradual and the existing levees held and there was much less damage: \$166 million in 2007 and \$7 million in 2009. Preparation is good and we need to do a better job. Realistically, except for some small projects, we will not see anything major done in many years, beginning in 2014 and finishing in 2020. The PUD project could be 12 to 20 years out and we must be able to deal with flooding in the meantime.

Commissioner Willis stated in the lower reaches people were better prepared or aware of what they needed to do. The reaction was quicker and the damage was less with very little damage along the rivers. The diverted water created more damage.

Mr. Carlton asked how we keep this in the forefront so people are prepared to react. This could be something to work on over the summer.

The scope of work gets to the point that we want a more coordinated warning system throughout the basin. DOT wants more warning about when the highway needs to be closed.

Mr. Carlton summarized the paper in the packet. There was discussion regarding the need for more real time gauges. He stated with an early warning system communities would get more points in the Community Rating System (CRS).

Ms. Hoffman stated the agenda for this afternoon calls for action to direct Lewis County on behalf of the Flood Authority to advertise for Request for Qualifications.

Discussion followed regarding the Public Works roster and contacting USGS for the work. Ms. Hoffman stated it will be re-worded to "undertake an appropriate consultant process".

There was also discussion regarding sandbagging efforts, getting information to the public and locations of sandbags that will be convenient to the communities. Coordination of these efforts needs to be addressed.

6. Break

The meeting was recessed at 10:30 for fifteen minutes.

7. Flood Plan Workshop

Ms. Hoffman stated the discussion of the Flood Plan would be abbreviated because of time. She called attention to three chapters: 1, 8 and 9. Members have been receiving these chapters and at the end of June you will receive the entire draft plan. It will have these chapters as well as the preceding chapters and Chapter 9 will be revised from what you see today based on discussion in the next 45 minutes. There will be further discussion going into July and August.

Mr. Carlton stated Lewis County has caught the attention of FEMA headquarters and they think the organization we have undertaken is a very good first step. He quickly went through the PowerPoint.

Insurance is not listed in Nonstructural Solutions. If you have flood insurance, part of your policy is to raise your structure or will allow for a buy-out. Insurance is good to have.

Chairman Averill stated there is new legislation and you can no longer put a UGA in a flood plain except under certain conditions where you must prove you have no other alternative for economic development expansion.

Mr. Carlton is starting to think we should not use the flood plain in the same way. FEMA has a predicted flood plain and some areas not in the flood plain have been flooded. How will these be identified, by our history or by FEMA?

Ms. Hoffman stated some actions have been taken by some jurisdictions and the regulatory programs yet to come. We are organizing a work group to authorize that this afternoon.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated she would like this plan to be a comprehensive compendium of possible actions that some jurisdictions have already taken so people reading the plan know the whole catalog of possibilities and that some actions have been taken somewhere. Is that the way to think about this?

Mr. Carlton stated you have an outline and you don't have the activities or explanations of activities, or potential impacts.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated we don't have a complete list and asked what the process is to add to or delete from the draft.

Ms. Hoffman stated the draft at the end of June will have a generic list of regulatory ideas. You are initiating a process to dig deeper into that by putting together an inventory of the regulatory programs that each jurisdiction has and providing a process for considering changes to those programs or options for going further. The Flood Authority itself will develop a "best of the best" land use practices and regulations to recommend to the jurisdictions. That will not be in the initial draft plan but undertaken during the next six months so it can be added to the draft plan for a set of recommendations.

Commissioner Willis stated this is the first cut and we will add to it and tailor it to the jurisdictions.

Chairman Averill stated we are looking at a development of the model of the FHMP for the Basin. We can't force it on anyone but we can recommend it as doing the best job.

Ms. Hoffman stated this is a presentation on generic alternatives. The plan goes into the generic Chapter 8, types of mitigation alternatives. Chapter 9 gets into the projects that you are considering. Ultimately we want you to make decisions, mixing and matching for your package for the Basin. The plan should take you from the generic to the specific. We need to discuss your prioritization process to do this.

Ms. Hoffman asked if we should continue or defer this process.

Chairman Averill opted to defer so people can have a chance to review the materials.

Mr. Mackey asked that the members consider the actual elements that have been identified, things you need to know to make decisions. Decide if those are what you want, and we will rank them. Apply those to your smaller projects and get used to using the system to see how it works and then apply them to the larger projects. He suggested looking to see if the 11 elements are the ones you want. Spencer put it into yes/no format and then there is high, medium or low rating. That is the background – think of this as three groups: the lists of projects to determine what you want to do; larger projects and non-project proposals. We will assign a large chunk of time for this at the next work session. We need to do something now and this is where you will develop the tool and make decisions.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:35 A.M.

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

**June 18, 2009 – 1:30 P.M.
Meeting Notes**

Members Present: Ron Averill, Lewis County; Dolores Lee, Town of Pe Ell; Jim Cook, City of Aberdeen; Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County; Dan Thompson, City of Oakville; Bill Bates, City of Centralia; Chad Taylor, City of Chehalis; Glen Connelly, Chehalis Tribe; Ron Schillinger, City of Montesano; Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County
Members Absent: Kathy Martin, Town of Bucoda

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from Work Session and Business Meeting of May 21, 2009
- Twin Cities Project Coordination Report
- Memo re: Earth Economics Contract
- Earth Economics Scope of Work
- ESA Adolfson Proposed Contract Amendment
- Memo re: Early Warning System
- Request for Qualifications: Early Warning System
- Memo re: Consideration of Regulatory Programs
- Expenditure Review
- Letter from EES Consulting
- Flood Authority Update, June 2009
- Memo re: Formation of a Tri-County Flood Control District

1. Call to Order

Chairman Averill called the meeting to order at 1:32 P.M.

2. Introductions

Members and attendees introduced themselves.

3. Review and Approval of Agenda

The Chair stated there would be no State Contingent Report and there was the addition of a report from Dave Muller, PUD, regarding the EES Consulting letter. Without objection the agenda was approved with additions.

4. Approve Meeting Notes

There were no additions or corrections to the work session and business meeting notes on May 21, 2009. A motion was made and seconded to approve and carried unanimously.

5. Public Comment

Ms. Vernadel Peterson, Centralia-Chehalis Chamber of Commerce, stated the Chamber is concerned about flood mitigation in the Chehalis Basin. The Chamber requested that the Salzer and Coal Creek Flood Mitigation Investigation on the Flood Authority Project List be considered as a high priority.

There are nearly 80 businesses along the Miracle Mile, which involves about 1600 residents who are employed there, and wages that total \$52,000,000 which affects our economy when they are unemployed during a flood. Plans need to be considered to protect businesses along the Miracle Mile from Salzer and Coal Creek flooding. Ms. Peterson thanked the Flood Authority for considering this request.

Mr. Vince Panesko stated he studied the map for the proposed retention dam. He stated the Phase I report did not include all of the costs, which include removing the dirt to prepare the dam and the cost to purchase the timber on the 1600 acres that is needed to build the dam. There are benefits that cannot be allowed in a cost benefit study but there was no peer review. This is a flawed report and yet there is an approved expenditure of \$250,000 or more for Phase II.

Mr. Taylor asked if the Phase I and Phase II study would include the information mentioned by Mr. Panesko.

Chairman Averill stated that is the function of Phase II. Phase I was predominately a study to determine whether there was the capability of doing water retention. A number of issues that we discussed while approving this project are of concern and would be part of the Phase II study, and these are in the contract that was signed with EES and the PUD.

Mr. Taylor asked if the Corps study referred to was the '82 Corps study. Mr. Taylor did not see where that study stated dams are not feasible or doable. There were portions in the study that stated dams would reduce water at Mellen St. by over two feet. There was mention of some issues with soil and where extra footings would need to be put in, but it did not say that dams are not feasible.

6. Reports

a) Chairman's Report

Commissioner Averill stated ESA Adolfson has been providing monthly updates and the update for June 2009 is in the packet and he encouraged the jurisdictions to share this with their constituents.

Commissioner Averill stated Mr. Bruce Mackey is the new project manager with ESA Adolfson and asked Mr. Mackey to share his background with the Flood Authority.

Mr. Mackey stated he was very pleased to be here. He was raised on a cattle ranch and has a PhD in agriculture and resource economics. He worked about 13 years in the university system teaching research and extension, and another 20 years with DNR. Mr. Mackey stated natural resources are very important to him, rural communities are

important to him, and having worked with DNR he was heavily involved in the clean up of the 2007 flood.

Mr. Mackey thanked Linda Hoffman, who was tremendous in stepping in to fill the breach left by Mr. Sharar. He stated he will be happy to follow in Mr. Sharar's footsteps and if he does half as well, we will be successful.

Chairman Averill also wanted to thank Ms. Hoffman for running the project; she has done a very good job. She is the government relations member and will continue to work with us.

Chairman Averill stated later in the meeting there will be an update regarding the Twin Cities Project and wanted to let the members know about some up-coming open houses. The Governor's office is coordinating the open house and it will most likely be on September 30 from 4:00 to 7:00 at the Centralia Middle School. It will be advertised ahead of time. Similar open houses will be held in Thurston County and Grays Harbor County.

Mr. Schillinger stated Grays Harbor County has scheduled its open house for September 23.

Chairman Averill received a letter from Stacy Davis, Lewis County Public Utilities District #1 regarding a kick-off meeting for the Phase II environmental studies water retention facilities in the Basin. That meeting will be June 25 at the Veterans Museum at 8:00 A.M.

Chairman Averill stated Dave Carlton, ESA Adolfson, sent out a summary document regarding local revenue generation for flood control. It is a good document to show how other jurisdictions have moved toward flood control districts and their sources of money and other issues relative to the formation of a district. He recommends the reading of that memo.

This morning there was a work session at the Veterans Museum and a number of issues were discussed regarding the development of our Flood Hazard Management Plan. Also discussed was the issue of the 2007 flooding in Adna and some preliminary studies conducted by the Corps looking at potential resolutions. There are a number of areas that are problematic. Among the solutions was work on the berm of the Willapa Trail, which is an old railroad line that was converted to Rails to Trail and is part of the State Parks system. Unfortunately the rules for Rails to Trail leave the ability for the trains to reestablish a line on the path of the Rails to Trail. To get the authority for easements and do work with that particular berm are very problematic. There are other solutions to consider. This was one of the ripe and ready projects and we are asking the Board Advisory Committee to look at the report and make some recommendations to us. While there are funding mechanisms for this project, getting it approved will put any work done on the project out to 2011. We may be able to do something with the other projects we are working on in the Basin.

We have authority for a General Investigation (GI) Study that has congressional funding of \$574,000. We are working with the Chehalis Basin Partnership on expanding a GI study they started in 2000 so we could put the two studies together and work toward the objectives of both the Partnership and the Flood Authority. It may be possible, if we could figure out how to use some of the money from the GI study, to at least do a second phase of feasibility on the Adna project. We are asking the BAC to look at that and make some recommendations.

Ms. Laura Orr stated the Corps would need to look at the federal rules on that and would want to see what other options it can consider.

b) Member Reports

There were no member reports.

c) Correspondence

Chairman Averill discussed the correspondence earlier in the Chair's report.

d) State Contingent Report

There was no State Contingent Report

e) Twin Cities Project Coordination Team

Ms. Orr filled in for John Donahue who was on vacation.

The Adna Project is something the Corps could work on if someone wants to step in as a non-federal sponsor. A non-federal sponsor must be able to tax and condemn land, such as Lewis County.

Ms. Orr introduced Mr. Bill Goss, the new Project Manager.

Regarding the Twin Cities project, there are a number of teams, such as a technical team and a mitigation team. There is also a coordination team and Mr. Donahue wanted to make sure the Flood Authority feels adequately represented. From the Corps' standpoint, there is not a problem with any government agency participating. When the team was set up, the suggested members were the Corps, Senior Agency Managers, Project Managers, Tribal Governments and the Flood Authority. It was unknown if the Flood Authority would want more than one member. The Corps welcomes all agencies. The purpose of the team is for policy and guidance rather than technical assistance. It is up to the Authority how many members are represented.

Chairman Averill stated this had been discussed in November and at that time the Tri-Cities levee project was lead agent out of the Governor's office by a memorandum of agreement between OFM and the Corps of Engineers. The Governor's office is very interested in the Flood Authority being involved in these discussions. It was believed the Coordination Team meetings would be in Seattle and the Flood Authority voted to have Chairman Averill attend for policy issues and there would be other committees that

would talk about technical details in which all jurisdictions would have an opportunity to participate.

Only one meeting was held as a policy group and because of lack of funding other meetings had not been held until just recently. The project is now appropriated by Congress and we are moving forward. The Coordination Team discussions will now be held locally.

Ms. Orr stated this is the Flood Authority's project so the meetings will be held in the Lewis County area. She does not foresee these meetings being held more than a couple of times a year. With the potential issues that may come up on a large project it would be beneficial to have guidance from the cities, elected officials and the community on the policy and guidance issues.

Mr. Taylor asked what type of policy decisions are made at these meetings.

Ms. Orr stated if there is a real estate discussion regarding easements or land use, etc, those are policy decisions. The Corps will continue to coordinate with the cities but if there is a policy issue with what the Corps is doing, we want to keep everyone apprised of the project.

If the State builds a project and it is turned over to a local jurisdiction to operate, for example you go through the process to become a diking district and you take over the project, it would be beneficial to have someone there representing the community all along the design and construction phases.

The Chair recommended, without objection, that the membership on the Coordination Team be representatives of the Flood Authority or their designated representative. There was no objection.

Everyone present at the Flood Authority meeting wanted to be represented.

The Chair recognized Mr. Dave Muller, Lewis County PUD.

Mr. Muller summarized what the PUD has been doing for the past six weeks. One item is the property owner access issue. The PUD has verbal permission from Mr. Panesko, an access agreement with CR Pacific, and Weyerhaeuser provided a road use permit. EES Consulting, PUD and Shannon and Wilson, the geo technical firm, now have access to the property.

Fisheries and Environmental work has been a fact finding process so far. The PUD did meet with the Tribal members who have a lot of information about fisheries, water quality, etc. What we have to date will be at the kick-off meeting next Thursday at the Veterans Museum. If anyone did not receive an invitation, it begins at 8:00 A.M. on June 25. There will be a scoping document of an outline of information available so far and an outline of what is missing. After that meeting and additional data gathering, the agencies,

tribe and stakeholders will define what additional studies need to be done to verify spawning grounds, water quality, temperatures, etc.

The other area of investigation has to do with the geo techs Shannon and Wilson. Most of their time has been spent looking at maps and geo technical data. They have talked with Sierra Pacific. The timber companies have a lot of geo technical information. We should be on the property soon conducting site investigation from the geo technical standpoint and from the fisheries standpoint.

Mr. Panesko raised good questions regarding information in the Phase I study. We will be addressing those specific issues with regard to the earthen dam, the exact site, what amount of overburden might have to be removed or stabilized, as well as more investigation into land and property values.

Mr. Thompson asked if the timber could be sold and the cost recovered.

Mr. Muller stated there are land values and timber values and there is more than one way to do land acquisition. In some cases you can pay the property owner the true and fair value or the property owner can log it and take the value. Those discussions have not yet taken place. There could be land mitigation or trade.

7. Ecosystem Services

Mr. Bob Johnson stated the contract with Earth Economics was originally to be an interlocal agreement between Lewis County and Grays Harbor County because the original contract was to go through Grays Harbor who is the lead agent for the Chehalis Partnership. Since the \$75,000 that was allocated from the Flood Authority is the only money toward this project it made more sense to enter into the contract directly with Earth Economics and make sure the needs of both organizations are met.

Mr. Batker and Chairman Averill discussed the needs of the Flood Authority and the draft contract is before you. Mr. Batker will speak to you to clarify any issues.

Mr. Batker stated this agreement is tied to a National Science Foundation grant and Earth Economics has done a lot of flood work, some in Louisiana around hurricane protection. That worked changed the prioritization of projects in Louisiana. A diversion was approved to expand restoration that provides greater hurricane protection than only investing in levees. One piece of critical information: we map flooding and we look at hydrological movements but we do not map flood protection. We don't map levels of ponding or the impacts of forests for slowing down peak flows or the importance of flood ways for the total prevention map. Levees and dams would be included.

One new vision is this mapping piece which we will work closely with the Army Corps of Engineers. Another piece is identification of the entire suite of Eco Systems services, so this will be one of the biggest investments in the Chehalis Basin. It will be important to look at how the investments work together. Flood protection is one Eco System

service and storm water removal is another. If you don't have a vision for how these fit together, one investment could damage another investment.

To make your prioritization decisions, you need to know the dollar value of these Eco Systems services. We want to see the best possible economic analysis for agricultural lands and the job provisions.

Earth Economics will provide a list of funding mechanisms including federal, local, and others. When you are setting up a new flood district you must know what funding mechanisms can be utilized.

We would like to move along as soon as possible because it will be of more value to you.

Chairman Averill stated we did not ask for the RFQ or RFP because those had already been done by Grays Harbor County as the lead agent for the Chehalis Basin Partnership. They were not able to find enough money to continue funding it and therefore suggested partnering with the Flood Authority. The product goes to both the Partnership and the Flood Authority.

Originally there was a more formal contract and it was determined a personal services agreement was more appropriate for this type of contract. The Flood Authority is the source of the income support with Lewis County acting as the lead agent.

Chairman Averill asked Mr. Batker if the scope of work could be added to so that it directly relates to flood mitigation.

Mr. Batker stated the focus will be on flood protection but we will bring in salmon restoration and a variety of other Eco System services. This will probably be the first time a watershed has been mapped based on flood protection structure, both natural and built structures.

Chairman Averill asked if the Corps and the Authority will talk to each other.

Ms. Orr stated the Corps will need to know if this will benefit Corps projects. She does not know if the Corps can use the data.

The Chair stated on Mr. Batker's behalf that after the last meeting Mr. Batker had to leave town on a project so there are still some things that need to be done.

Mr. Batker stated he would like to meet and he believes his data will be very useful to the Corps. The Corps modeling was used in King County and it was put into the King County flood plan which got a five star rating from the Corps. When we did the Eco System Service analysis in Louisiana, and one of the issues that fits here as well, was the fact that originally the Corps did not recognize wetlands as providing storm protection benefits against flooding from hurricanes. By the end of the dialogue, the Corps adopted the fact that wetlands reduce storm surges from hurricanes and projects were re-allocated

on a large scale. The Corps stated that by having wetlands in front of every levee a lot of money could be saved because the wave action is reduced by the wetlands.

Ms. Hoffman stated one way the consulting team can be of assistance is to facilitate setting up a meeting between the Corps, Earth Economics, and any members of the Flood Authority who would like to attend. She stated there was a meeting in early April with the Corps to talk about the General Investigation and at that time there was discussion about openness and flexibility on the part of the Corps in evaluating eco system benefits from a quantitative cross benefits study than there is under the separate project.

Ms. Orr stated the Corps can look at things like flood damage reduction on structures; however the Corps cannot put a dollar value on habitat.

Ms. Hoffman stated hopefully because the GI is geared toward both ecosystem restoration and flood damage reduction we will be able to use it flexibly as we move along.

Mr. Schillinger thanked Mr. Johnson and Mr. Batker for working on the revised document together. The study is not just about eco system benefits but benefits that directly affect the people. We will need it for prioritizing, mapping and funding. Montesano is all for moving forward with it.

Chairman Averill stated without objection the Flood Authority will approve of Lewis County going ahead with the personal services agreement with Earth Economics and Lewis County for the Flood Authority. Hearing no objection it was approved.

8. ESA Adolfson Proposed Contract Amendment

Mr. Johnson stated the members had in their packets a draft extension of the personal services agreement. The County, on behalf of the Flood Authority, entered into an interlocal agreement with the Office of Financial Management and revised the budget to include an additional \$400,000 for the next State fiscal year. There is money in the budget for the consulting services. This would allocate the monies as set forth in the scope that is identified in the contract to continue with Phase II and work through Phase III work that was identified within the contract.

The Chair asked if there were any questions; there were none. Without objection this contract is approved. There were no objections and the contract was approved.

9. Early Warning System

Mr. Dave Carlton stated a recommendation for the ripe and ready projects is the development of a basin-wide early warning system, coordinated between the three counties and the cities. A draft Request for Qualifications is in the member packet. The major tasks include: working with the communities to determine their needs; develop recommendations for a flood warning system; including the potential for precipitation and/or stream gauges; real time gauges, enhancing flood warning notification; options for integrating communications systems; identifying funding options and providing the Flood

Authority with technical guidance. This could go out for RFQ from Lewis County or we could go to their Public Works Roster and select from that.

Ms. Shirley Kook, Lewis County Utility Engineer, indicated this morning that it might be better to go through the RFQ, RFP process versus the PSA. Lewis County uses the PSA process with USGS. Chairman Averill stated we would still like that latitude if that is the best way to go.

Chairman Averill stated this is the first time this has come before this body. He asked the pleasure of the Authority to go ahead or table it until the next meeting.

Mr. Schillinger stated everyone is on board in terms of the objectives and goals and thought the Authority should move ahead.

It was moved and seconded to approve. Motion approved.

10. Regulatory Program

Ms. Linda Hoffman stated there is a memo regarding a regulatory program in the member packet. At the May work session there was a discussion about the approach the Flood Authority wanted to take to considering regulatory programs for land use plans and regulations for flood damage reduction. We recommended a scope of work that was discussed and revised. The memo summarizes three steps: 1 - An evaluation of regulatory approaches to development in the flood plain from the perspective of risks to existing and proposed structures; ecological risks and emergency management costs; 2 – A review of what the options are for credit under the Community Rating System to reduce flood insurance premiums, and the development of findings and options around best management practices and model regulations for local jurisdictions to consider. At that point the work group would develop options for consideration by the Authority and the Authority would use those findings to develop a set of either model regulations or best practices that could be used by the local jurisdictions in determining what regulations they want to adopt.

We are asking today for your authorization to begin work on this. It would start by establishing a work group which would include the Board Advisory Committee, plus the appropriate land use and building code staff people from the jurisdictions.

The Chair stated we were being asked to authorize ESA Adolfson to work with our BAC and representatives of planning and building departments. The work group will develop findings and options for building and land use regulations to achieve flood damage reduction. Without objection, the Authority will adopt this recommendation. There were no objections.

Ms. Hoffman stated it was mentioned this morning that in the draft comprehensive flood hazard management plan there will be a generic set of land use actions and regulations that you can consider. Some of those are in use now and some are not in use at all locally but used in other parts of the State or country. This effort will take a look at those

generic approaches and tailor them into a set that you want to recommend to the Chehalis Basin jurisdictions for consideration and adoption.

11. Expenditure Review

Mr. Bob Johnson stated the expenditure review was included in the packet. A new column has been added: Adjusted Budget Amount. That reflects the budget change following the supplemental agreement with the OFM. The original budgeted amount went down with regard to the most current interlocal agreement as did some of the other items. In particular, goods and services and consulting services went up as did travel for Flood Authority members. The balance is \$2,044,968.40.

The Chair stated progress report #10 from ESA Adolfson is also in the packet.

12. Clarification of Respective Roles of Flood Authority and Chehalis Basin Partnership

Chairman Averill stated we are now in our second cooperation agreement with the Chehalis Basin Partnership. The GI study is one of those projects and the Earth Economics is the other project. It might be beneficial to the Authority to learn what the Partnership does. The Chair asked Ms. Lee Napier to lead the discussion.

Ms. Napier works for Grays Harbor County, is on the Board Advisory Committee for the Flood Authority, and is the project manager for the Chehalis Basin Partnership.

Ms. Napier wished to share her observations on why cooperation between the Partnership and the Flood Authority is becoming an issue. She is hearing from members of the group about the relationship between the watershed work being done by the Partnership and the Flood Authority. It is unclear whether these questions are being raised because there is confusion about the roles between the groups or if there is some other motive. After her explanation of the Partnership's role, there will be a discussion about whether there is the desire to continue working together.

Ms. Napier explained that the Chehalis Basin Partnership is a planning unit, formed in 1997 following a storm event that involved people impacted by the storm. In 1998 the Legislature codified Chapter 982, the Watershed Planning Act.

As a planning unit the work focused on water quality, water quantity and habitat. We assessed what data is out there and what is missing. We developed a Watershed Management Plan which included citizen outreach. Four counties came together to approve the Watershed Management Plan in 2004. We developed a detailed implementation plan and to this day we continue to implement that plan and the Watershed Management Plan has actions that we implement.

We have a coordinated water quality monitoring program and the Partners are implementing it. The Chehalis Tribe is collecting the data and Grays Harbor College is housing the data and creating a State of the Rivers report. We have outreach in education

of all levels, whether it's the stream team or talking to people about the watershed to find out what they are doing.

We did a water balance. Because of the large watershed we were not able to balance the water throughout the Basin but we looked at it from a pilot level. We did an assessment of multi-purpose storage and have a grant for feasibility of candidate sites for storage.

One of the Partnership's top priorities is to understand the interaction between ground and surface water. It is a very complex issue. It is a project that USGS would take a lead on and is a top priority through the plan.

While all of the above was going on, Grays Harbor as the sponsor and working with the Partnership, was concurrently working on an ecosystem general investigation. We entered into a cost share agreement with the Corps of Engineers. The work we did through watershed planning, getting grants from DOE, served as match to the Ecosystem project. The Corps staff was very involved and helped us develop our plan and they listened to the data gaps. For the in-stream flow project we gathered data one year and did not have the money to fund it the second year and the Corps gathered the data for that year.

The spin-off project is the project before you to consider: the Satsop Floodplain Restoration Project.

While the Partnership continues to implement the detailed implementation plan and the Watershed management plan, we recognize the work of the Flood Authority. Ms. Napier has heard comments that the Partnership's work would be useful to the Flood Authority. This attention is a result of the 2007 event. The Partnership has been together for almost a decade. When the 2007 event hit people were cut off and Ms. Napier was getting calls about other people in the Partnership. We are very concerned about the welfare of people. If our meetings were canceled we were unable to communicate.

It's because of this history that we have concerns about flooding and future events. After the 2008 event we were so busy we did not know who would look after the flooding and if there was a role we should be serving. In February when it looked like the Legislature would create a body we recognized that the Flood Authority would play a role and we would step back. The Partnership is not doing the role of the Flood Authority. We are interested only in being a partner. We deal with low flow conditions, the Flood Authority deals with high flow conditions. There is a connection between the two.

That is the overview of what we have done and why we are concerned about flooding and ask the questions: Is there an interest in continuing to work together and if so what would that interest be?

Commissioner Willis stated Ms. Napier mentioned a match of dollars that the Partnership has accrued. What is the dollar amount?

Ms. Napier stated through the Watershed Planning process and technical assessment process we accumulated before we stopped counting about \$1million. There is \$1million worth of work that the Corps needs to match. They have not matched that. We knew we had money up front but we did not know what our financial situation would be three or four years later. We worked out an arrangement with the Corps where we provided our match up front so we had a reserve and when we were ready to work with the Corps on projects that money would be available.

Chairman Averill stated the funding from the Department of Ecology has been significantly cut back as is almost everything. There is not as much money available now as there was before. If there is no other reason, from economic necessity we need to work with each other. One part of the equation is ecosystem restoration and there are things that can be done for ecosystem restoration that can work toward some types of flood mitigation. The Chair suggested that there are some things done in flood mitigation that may eventually prove valuable for ecosystem restoration. There are cross purposes where we can help each other out.

Does the Flood Authority want the staff of the respective entities to develop a draft document presenting individual roles and areas of overlap between the two entities? We could discuss this at the July meeting.

Commissioner Willis stated there is a correlation between water quality and the flood issues. When we do restoration there are issues that could help: it does not create less water but it helps clean up those waters. There are two separate organizations, both of them non-regulatory, but they do complement each other. She agreed with Commissioner Averill regarding the monetary cooperation. She is in favor of this and has had requests from the Grays Harbor area to define the entities.

Mr. Schillinger stated nearly every jurisdiction represented on the Flood Authority had gained information and trust with Lewis County when Richard Graham was the leader of the Partnership. He believes it is a great partnership.

Mr. Connelly agreed and stated it is important to document the roles of the organizations but there will be a lot of overlap. The Flood Authority is currently spending \$250,000 to study fish habitat and water quality issues and that is a direct relation to some of the work of the Partnership. The Tribe has put in for a grant to remove a farm dike near Oakville and restore the river channel migration zone and correct a creek that has been blocked up to allow fish habitat for fourteen miles.

Chairman Averill stated without objection we will direct staff of both organizations to provide an overview of the purposes of each organization and we will discuss it in July.

13. Flood District Consideration

Chairman Averill stated he has been providing an update on where the Authority is with the Tri-County Flood Control District and distributed a memorandum on the formation of

such a district. He summarized the memo, which included the nature and purpose of a district, the formation of a district, action by the Tri-County Boards of County Commissioners and the current status.

Chairman Averill stated he believes the earliest we could come to a vote on forming a flood control district is in the general election of November 2010, which means all of the steps must be completed by June, 2010. The result of the Elway survey indicated we may have difficulty getting this approved by the voters. He entertained questions.

Commissioner Valenzuela understands the difference between the existing Flood Authority and the proposed district is the ability to levy taxes or write contracts.

Chairman Averill stated that is correct; currently Lewis County is doing that because the Flood Authority does not have the authority.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated that for the average citizen this is a lot of bureaucratic speak. In the absence of the formation of a district it does not become a barrier for the Flood Authority to move forward to do as much as it possibly can.

Chairman Averill stated we understood there would be a lot of work in forming a flood control district and that was the main purpose in forming the Flood Authority. Once we get projects in place, who will operate them and maintain them? We are a cooperative association of 11 jurisdictions and it makes more sense to have a body which is specifically directed towards that type of activity.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated Thurston County is the largest county in this district and there is no commissioner from the unincorporated areas and she discouraged making differentiations. We all work for all the citizens of the County.

Commissioner Averill stated when he spoke of commissioners from the Flood District he was not speaking of County Commissioners, but flood district commissioners.

Commissioner Willis referred to the second page of the memo which states that the respective engineers are currently working on the boundary. She understood that had been approved in December of 2008.

Chairman Averill stated that was directed but because of the flood that occurred at that time the first meeting was not held until April and that planning is currently under way.

14. Confirm Next Meeting and Board-Requested Topics

The next meeting will be Thursday, July 16, with a work session at 9:00 A.M. and the business meeting at 1:30 P.M. Ms. Hoffman stated the BAC would meet Friday, June 19 at ESA Adolfson at 1:00 P.M. and again on July 7 at 1:00 P.M.

15. Adjourn

Adjournment was at 3:25 P.M.