

**Flood Authority Work Session
March 19, 2009
Veteran's Memorial Museum
100 SW Veterans Way
Chehalis, WA 98532**

Meeting Notes

1. Convene Work Session

Chairman Averill called the meeting to order at 9:12 A.M. Members present: Mark White, Dan Thompson, Jim Cook, Terry Willis, Karen Valenzuela, Kathy Martin, Bob Nacht (for Chad Taylor), Ron Schillinger

Chairman Averill stated the work sessions are for specific issues to discuss, where we are going and procedures outside of the regular meeting, which is scripted with business at hand. He was pleased to see the principals at the meeting.

2. Introductions

Introductions were made.

4. Consensus Workshop

Ms. Hoffman stated there would be a minor change in the agenda: reversing Items 3 and 4. Ms. Linda Hoffman stated she would spend some time on the Flood Authority processes for new members not on board when the rules of procedure were adopted and for important items that are coming before the board for decisions for the first time. There would also be a brief discussion about consensus, how you want it to work for you and the BAC's role in helping you make decisions.

A packet was distributed titled Materials on Consensus. The first section is what is in the Rules of Procedure on decision making and key pieces. The 2nd sentence states decisions shall be made by verbal consensus. If a decision cannot be reached there are three options; A, B, C.

What may not be clear is how do you work toward consensus and create an environment in which consensus is a norm. Also included are for your review: why consensus, etc.

Ms. Hoffman referred to the 2nd page, 3rd paragraph: "In order to achieve a condition"..... With this in mind, have a discussion about what consensus means to you regarding the Flood Authority issues before you and how you would like it to work. 3rd page offers an appendix from the Chehalis Basin Partnership, which is conducted in accordance with Roberts Rules of Order and this is what has been used and has been fairly successful. It was proposed to the Flood Authority for a process used in discussion.

Ms. Hoffman asked for thoughts.

Mark White asked at what point is a consensus a super majority?

Ms. Hoffman stated you need to figure out what might be consensus. If you have one or more members who still have concerns and are unwilling to support decisions the others want, when do you call it quits in working toward consensus and either tabling it or voting.

Mr. White stated most topics have 10 minutes for discussion between 11 people.

Ms. Hoffman asked if more time is needed for consensus.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated the rules of procedure are confusing. She understands consensus, but you can make a motion by using Robert's Rules, and a motion is amendable. As soon as a motion is made you have moved away from a consensus issue to Robert's Rules.

Chairman Averill stated it is not an inconsistency, whether by vote or consensus. The Chehalis Basin Partnership in developing the consensus model was trying to use a process that would bring people aboard so they could work towards solutions. When we did the interlocal we recognized in some cases we would make some decisions where there would not be consensus but we did not want the group bogged down. Rules allow if we cannot find consensus then we go to a super majority vote, which is 60%.

Mr. Jim Cook stated consensus is that all parties are of a like mind or amenable to making the same decision. Super majority has already happened on some issues in the need for expediency. When you take a vote you know if you have consensus. He suggested that after taking a vote give the people another opportunity to say why they voted and make a conscious effort to get to a consensus.

Ms. Hoffman stated you can take a straw vote and word it that it is not an ultimate vote but a vote on whether you want to talk about items or you want to talk about pros and cons. You can get a sense of where people are and then work towards consensus.

Chairman Averill stated the Partnership talked about adopting a water shed plan and there was dialogue on the board and we called for the question. An issue came up so we listened to the concern and then modified the plan. It gives the opportunity for people to raise questions and it gets them involved in a dialogue. In the watershed plan we were up against the deadline and when we finished we had a good product.

Commissioner Willis stated she likes the process as applied to the Flood Authority since we are a multi-county body and we are looking at issues all over. Don't jump from consensus to vote quickly because it gives us an opportunity to address an issue. Use the voting process as a last resort. She likes consensus because you don't have to vote to like it 100%. Someone may say he or she will pass it but here are things that they do not agree with totally. Sometimes those issues can be moved as you go along.

Ms. Hoffman stated at work sessions no decisions are made and you need to look at the discussion of substance on decisions coming before the Flood Authority. You can make decisions on the process, but these work sessions are not defined as decision-making meetings.

Commissioner Willis stated this is the arena where we can say what our thoughts are.

Mr. Bob Johnson stated he has worked on lots of groups by consensus. What works well is the straw vote because it gives the opportunity for people to talk about why they are opposed to an issue and discuss ways to get people to a thumbs up. He would encourage that type of dialogue and it is easy to do.

Ms. Hoffman stated for people who have concerns, you need to create an environment for them to feel comfortable to state why they have a concern. If they can't support it and won't implement the decision then you have to weigh what it is worth to go to a vote. We are trying to create a strong Authority and enable you to make important decisions.

Mr. Schillinger stated we have dealt with the consensus and it almost ended several times because you can only talk about things so much and you have to make a decision. There is a limit – you do what you can and he has been on juries and dealt with that. He does not find there is anyone at this table who would hesitate to state what they think or what they want. Regarding the dam and Mark's questions, Mark asked for a delay and that was fine. Questions got answered and now it is time to move on. He welcomes further discussion but he does not want to walk away from another meeting with nothing getting accomplished.

Mr. White stated he agreed with that and there has to be a time frame to make a decision.

Chairman Averill also agreed. If there is only a 15 minute discussion that might be unreasonable and if the discussion is pertinent to the project we will extend the time. He also agreed with Mr. Schillinger that we either have to find consensus or vote.

Mr. Cook stated we all signed the interlocal agreement. Once it comes to a super majority, that super majority becomes the point of view of everyone. We want to get beyond studying and do something.

Commissioner Willis stated we do have a clock ticking. We have met with legislatures and there is a June timeline for a list of projects and they are telling us that money will disappear if an agreement is not reached.

Ms. Martin agreed with consensus. The bylaws state that something presented at a meeting will not be voted upon at that meeting. We do have a time line and would like to move forward.

Ms. Hoffman stated she understands that you want opportunity either through amendments to a motion or a straw vote to give people an opportunity to say why they

are concerned and what alternatives they would propose but you do not want this to go on forever. If a consensus is not able to be reached, the Chair will note the concerns and he will entertain a motion to vote if you need a vote but you will do so knowing what the concerns are and if there is or is not a consensus.

3 - Discussion of BAC Role

We have staff members to assist us on advice – that committee would like a definition of its roles and what is expected of it. The three counties have full time staff but many of the smaller jurisdictions do not and if an issue affects a small city, then it can participate.

Mr. White asked if the citizens have a right to attend the BAC meetings.

Chairman Averill stated he sees no reason why they cannot. State agencies are attending as ex-officio. Most of us are under the open public meetings act and it is clear that we have to be careful that we do not deprive the public the opportunity to watch the process. Our meetings, unless we can find under the executive session clause to the contrary, are an open forum.

Commissioner Willis stated because it is an open meeting, there is an agenda and there is a space for public comment. Normally when the public shows up they have the opportunity to make comment.

Ms. Powe stated she has no chance to speak before voting. Being allowed to attend does not help because the public is not able to express itself and she would like to participate.

Commissioner Willis stated during the BAC meetings there are no votes taken. During regular meetings, citizens are encouraging the consensus process to take place. As a citizen you can talk to the Authority members at any time and that member can stop the process.

Ms. Powe agrees with the consensus and believes it should be an open discussion. But on the down side, she contacted several members on the water retention plan and not everyone responded.

Chairman Averill stated this is not a democracy; we have representatives and it is necessary to get business done and there are some rules. The State has procedures to allow for public comment and participation in the process such as this Flood Authority but they have to be within the rules. The members of this body have more privileges. We have to limit public participation and we chose the beginning of the meeting to allow comment. We will introduce something at one meeting and vote on it at the next.

Commissioner Valenzuela thanked Julie for being here. She has heard from many people but has not responded because she doesn't know enough. It is important to understand that just because you have not heard from us does not mean we are not considering you.

Mr. Johnson stated the Flood Authority requires public input. The BAC is not a meeting that is open to the public meeting because it is not a legislative body. We have work that we have to do and the public work is done by the Board not by Linda and Dave and Ann, etc. The BAC's work is a staff function that it does in support of the Flood Authority. It is not a meeting under the open meetings act. ESA has space concerns for the staff meeting. We don't make policy decisions and we are not legislating rules or spending public money.

Ms. Hoffman stated the paper speaks to the current BAC practice: review and amend board agendas, how the overall process is worked through and when, how to work through the chapters coming forward, review of the opinions of those chapters. We have been authorized to look at budgets and any other task delegated by the Authority. Would it be helpful to you to have staff reports, options, etc. coming before you? If so do you want it coming from the consultant with BAC review and recommendations? Do you want it on every item or only on items you refer? There are issues coming up: criteria for selecting projects and prioritization of flood hazard mitigations projects where BAC could play a role in options. If you want them to do that, then city staff could participate because we are missing that element.

Mr. Johnson stated originally his conception of the BAC role was to express the desires of the constituency. This opens it up to everybody and anybody can come. We are being used as a forum for making and influencing policies and that is not our intent. Opening it to everybody with an opinion is not what this is supposed to be about and would like clarification. He believes it should be limited.

Commissioner Averill stated if any of you have been following current legislation there is concern by the attorney general that citizens do have access to due process. We have work sessions where we have choices if we should open comment to the public but unless you are dealing with a hot issue there will not be a lot of people who show up. We have made some important decisions when no one showed up until after the fact, which is the nature of the business. His perception of the BAC was that it would perform in the way we normally deal with staff in helping us come to decisions; it would provide us a study of the issue we presented and it would give us the pros and cons and the BAC might make a recommendation and an alternative to that. Then the voting body would be presented with a report from the BAC that would provide us with the information to make the decision.

Commissioner Valenzuela agreed with Chairman Averill. She will be telling her staff there is nothing secret that the BAC does. We cannot deny the public the opportunity to attend.

Commissioner Willis stated the Chehalis Basin Partnership has the same type committee and has been doing it successfully. There are private citizens and other agencies who want to input information. She also agrees that mostly they are not attended. The success of the partnership was what went through the Technical Committee.

Ms. Hoffman understand the group wants the BAC to offer staff reports with analysis, pros and cons, options and recommendations on decision issues. You would like the BAC to be open to the public, agendas available in advance and notes sent out afterwards.

Mr. Mark Swartout stated once you trust the BAC, which must be earned and transparent, then please use us. Get used to saying the BAC can look at this and come back with options.

Mr. Martin stated she serves on a board for the homeless. There are lots of service providers who felt they did not have a voice. Presently we are forming an advisory committee of twenty members and one of their reps can sit at the table with us; he has no vote but he can talk.

Mr. Carlton asked if the board wants staff reports of everything that comes before you or just things that come by request.

Mr. White stated by requests only.

Commissioner Willis asked why the BAC would be working on things that we have not requested.

Mr. Carlton asked if you want staff reports as a matter of course or only those things that the Flood Authority has asked us for.

Chairman Averill stated we have the BAC and we also have the consultants.

Discussion followed.

Mr. Schillinger stated this body asks the consultants what to do, not the BAC.

Ms. Hoffman stated ESA responds directly, not through the BAC. She stated Ms. Martin raised the possibility of another mechanism for public participation and asked if that is something you want to come back to in the future.

Mr. Schillinger, Chairman Averill, Mr. White and Mr. Cook stated no, we need to maintain our appearance of transparency and the public should not be barred from participation. We don't want to alienate anyone.

Ms. Hoffman suggested that we make sure the way the web site is arranged and materials are presented so the public is able to track what is going on and what issues are coming before the Flood Authority. We will pay special attention to that.

Mr. White asked who has the authority to tell ESA what to do.

Mr. Carlton stated that is a question of the Authority.

Ms. Hoffman stated we have a scope of work that has been approved by the Flood Authority and it provides direction for accomplishing that scope of work. When it comes to additional work or talking to Authority members, we are here to support you and will talk to individual members, research technical issues, provide materials, but additional work beyond the scope of work would be brought to the Authority.

Commissioner Averill stated when we made our contract with ESA it was as facilitator/consultant. In that process, you may find ESA coming to you individually to resolve concerns. If we want to give ESA something outside the scope, then the Flood Authority will do that.

Commissioner Willis stated any existing contract that this body has agreed upon can be handled or managed by the BAC as opposed to them contracting outside the organization.

Mr. Carlton stated no, they do not. We can amend our scope.

Mr. Johnson wanted it understood that his comments do not suggest we are secretive. Clarification: if someone came to the BAC and had a project they wanted on the agenda, is it appropriate for the BAC to take that up or should we request it of the Flood Authority?

Chairman Averill stated if BAC makes recommendations most likely it will appear on the agenda. Other things can come before us without the BAC process.

Commissioner Willis suggested giving the BAC a task to write down what they perceive their role is and bring it back to us.

Commissioner Schulte stated the BAC should not be permanent standing members but should fluctuate depending on the advice you need; ie attorney or engineer.

Mr. White stated we have been operating under the same assumption.

Ms. Hoffman stated it is helpful to have some additional representation from cities. We can send out agendas to the appropriate people.

5 - Gauge Project Workshop

Ms. Ann Root stated she revised the report from January and it is on Share Point site and added section 4. She can provide the report in any other format if requested.

Ms. Root presented a PowerPoint.

New gauges that did not get on the list:
Sigmund Ford Bridge which would protect the Tribe and Bucoda.

Regarding WSDOT funding for gauges, John Donahue said that discussion could take place; however currently there is no funding available.

Commissioner Willis asked for two new flood gauges: one on the Wynoochee below the dam and on the Wynoochee River before Aberdeen.

Chairman Averill stated we need to determine where the gauges will be best for us. We won't see a true mitigation project up and working in the next few years so we need a system that will provide adequate warning, which worked in the 2009 flooding. Do we have the gauges in the right place, and are our emergency centers working adequately with each other. The State tends to let the EOCs work on their own. In Lewis County there are only two; one for the County and one for Centralia; but we do not work real well with Thurston EOC or the Tribe. Perhaps we need to work together.

Commissioner Willis stated she is talking about real time USGS gauges. She does not want to wait for the County to make an announcement. We monitor gauges on a regular basis. Because of the time frame it gives us 12 hours or more. The County could monitor those same gauges to determine if we need to activate our warning systems.

Chairman Averill stated these gauges are not inexpensive and the Flood Authority has a small pot of money and it could spend it all on the gauges. Is that the best use of our money? Right now, most are being operated by the Counties or public or private entities. We need to see where that fits in.

Mr. Swartout said to determine the best locations perhaps we could hire someone with this expertise to look at the whole picture. It may not be all the gauges people want. Ms. Willis can look at a gauge real time and know when the water will reach her farm. He agrees that real time gauges will help people avoid flood damage. We may not need to do them all if we hire someone to help us decide where the best places are to put gauges.

Ms. Root reminded everyone of Snohomish's ALERT system.

Commissioner Averill stated we also have river watchers who back up the gauges.

Ms. Hoffman stated there is an item in the contract for additional study and analysis, about \$60,000 that allows you to direct ESA for additional technical work; ie plan or development of a system that could perform the job you want in early warning. We could, if you direct, go through a process to get a consultant to come on and do that work. Mr. Carlton thought it would take \$50-\$75,000.

Chairman Averill suggested adding this to the agenda for this afternoon's meeting and a recommendation could be made at the April meeting.

Mr. Joseph Jones, USGS, states the USGS operates 20 gauges funded by nine partners, including the counties, USAC and USGS, and at the Skookumchuck Dam. A lot of those gauges are where they are at the request of our partner agencies. If you look at a map of

the basin and the gauges, you will see the distribution of gauges is fairly accurate. These gauges can go out in time of flooding. In Doty the water came up 15' higher than in 1996 and drowned out the electronics. You do need redundancy build in. Every gauge in the Chehalis Basin is in real time telemetry and updated hourly. We can provide links so your citizens can get information about what phase I or phase II means.

7. FloodPath Presentation

Mr. Jones presented a PowerPoint and distributed copies of a proposal for the Chehalis Basin.

Why floodpath: The actual forecast flood is mapped and it provides times of flood arrival.

Commissioner Willis asked if it takes in tidal influence.

Mr. Jones stated it can. This was designed for an area that is tidally influenced.

Commissioner Willis asked if this works with NOAA.

Mr. Jones stated USGS does not do the forecast. We get NOAA's forecast and feed it into the hydraulics and it is updated every six hours

Commissioner Willis thought closer updates would be more effective.

Mr. Jones did not agree. You have the map up to three days in advance and as they run successive models it changes very little but is more accurate.

Mr. Schillinger stated in 2009 we were glad the predictions were not as bad as expected. Mr. Jones said it was accurate but is there that kind of flexibility in terms of your model's accuracy?

Mr. Jones stated it is based on the accuracy of the weather service forecast.

Mr. Swartout stated the graphs are very accurate; there is no gauge in the Skookumchuck reservoir. There was a 20 foot capacity in the reservoir in 2009 and because there was no gauge they were predicting the reservoir was full.

Mr. Martin stated in Bucoda she got information from USGS and called the Skookumchuck dam. The reports were different. USGS said moderate flooding but water was coming so fast from the dam and tributaries that it came into town differently this time. It was not the 1996 flood but the USGS did not show that until afterwards.

Mr. Jones stated he showed the forecasts. There are a number of things that create errors: weather off the Pacific interacting with mountains; snow levels not known, etc.

Mr. Swartout stated a climatologist said there is no Doppler radar on the west coast.

Mr. Jones stated it is in the budget.

Mr. Carter asked what it would take to develop your model for the Chehalis River.

Mr. Jones stated that is in the handout. This proposal is for Doty to Grand Mound because of the forecast points. 42 miles is a long reach for a hydrologic model. There could be another model from Grand Mound to Grays Harbor.

Comment: Install gauges on the Skookumchuck, one above and one below. To work, the dam must release. Look at flood records of previous floods.

Chairman Averill stated we need to look at gauges and get emergency managers into the process as well.

8. Flood History Characteristics

Ms. Root had prepared chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Flood Hazard Plan. The 2007 and 2009 flood data is not final yet but will be added. She asked to have comments sent to her.

9. Project List Update.

Ms. Root has been receiving requests for projects and this is the update from last month. The new ones are highlighted; two submitted by Lewis County. They are the same categories as last time. On Page 2 she has separated out the studies; most were existing studies; the new ones are on back. The Corps has funding for basin-wide studies. As consultants we formalized opportunities for grants.

Ms. Hoffman stated in the context of evaluating what studies are most needed for basin wide decisions, you've been talking about phase studies in the upper basin as a ripe and ready project taken sooner rather than later. Consultants have worked with BAC to think about other studies that are potentially needed to make decisions on projects later in the process. The BAC developed recommendations on additional studies for you to consider. There was a memo to hand out but perhaps the BAC can help: Recommendation for developing a hydrologic model for above and below Grand Mound and the project you heard about last meeting goes to Grand Mound. There is interest in lower river jurisdictions having a tool. That was recommended by the BAC as an additional item for a ripe and ready studies package. The Chehalis Basin Partnership has a grant funded study for low flows and that is something the partnership is interested in seeing move forward. Page 2 – partnering with the Corps of Engineers. You will hear more about that this afternoon; re: funding authorized in the federal budget to advance basin wide investigation.

Chairman Averill stated all parties that have a stake of where we are going need to sit down and that would require a considerable change in the partnership

Ms. Hoffman stated the Corps wants to address how much was intended for what purpose and wants to talk to the Flood Authority about local sponsorship basinwide and then Grays Harbor County would be involved in the discussion and the Chehalis Basin Partnership would be involved. The Corps will address it in part but it is unknown what has been resolved yet. There will also be representatives from Congressman Baird's office regarding their role in this.

Chairman Averill stated cost sharing with the Corps differs depending on what you are doing. The levee project is at 65-35 federal/local split and studies are a 50-50 split.

Ms. Hoffman stated we need to partner with the Chehalis River Basin Partnership to identify all ecosystems benefited by flood protection and to put values on habitat protections and economic values received by putting protections on. Should this funding come from ripe and ready studies? There will be a groundwater study presentation this afternoon.

These studies were recommended for your consideration based on criteria in the memo for developing a ripe and ready package. This will be basin-wide and will help the Flood Authority make decisions on projects, including a basin-wide flood warning system.

We need to determine which studies you want to move forward with and consider at future meetings and how you get studies on your agenda.

Chairman Averill stated there are more than two Corps studies. Those studies presented by Ann are new studies that have been requested.

Ms. Hoffman stated you have the building project list that will stay open; a sub set of projects and studies; ripe and ready studies and proposals and those are for your consideration to move forward sooner because they will help you make decisions on projects.

10. Problem Areas Workshop

Ms. Root stated the next meeting will include a preview of Chapter 6 power point and analysis of issues in the Basin.

Ms. Root asked if there are major gaps or other descriptors that would be helpful in moving through this analysis. Next month we will continue; we will write up Chapter 6 and work on criteria that the Flood Authority will be dealing with.

Ms. Root stated any additions can go through Spencer such as input on Chapter 5, etc.

11. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:56.

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

**March 19, 2009 – 1:30 P.M.
Meeting Notes**

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

Others Present: Please see sign in sheets

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from February 19 work session and business meeting
- Expenditure Review
- ESA Monthly Status Report No. 7
- Letter from Republican Leadership
- Letter from Gary Alexander
- Letter from Port of Chehalis
- Letter from Centralia-Chehalis Chamber
- Letter to Mr. William Iyall, Cowlitz Indian Tribe
- City of Chehalis Resolution 5-2009
- Lewis County Resolution 09-091
- Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority Draft Resolution
- House Bills 5704 and 5705
- Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority Project List Proposals

1. Call to Order

Chairman Averill called the meeting to order at 1:50 P.M.

2. Introductions

Board members and guests introduced themselves.

3. Review and Approval of Agenda

Ms. Linda Hoffman asked to add the flood gauges project and discussion of possible next steps in analyzing the flood path proposal. This could go under item 8.

The agenda was approved without objection.

4. Approval of Meeting Notes

A motion was made and seconded to approve the meeting notes from the work session and the regular business meeting. Ms. Willis stated the Chehalis River Basin Partnership

is the correct name and had been called the Chehalis River Partnership. Without objection the meeting notes were approved.

5. Public Comment

Mr. Dave Muller, Lewis County PUD, stated a lot of work has been done reviewing information since the retention presentation at the last meeting and Mr. White's questions have been answered.

Mr. Muller stated the PUD approached this effort in a phased approach. Phase I is a high level reconnaissance; Phase II would be a more in-depth feasibility study; Phase III would be the design permitting and environmental stage. The high level does not answer all the questions but gives us an idea of whether or not it makes sense to move forward to Phase II. The PUD believes there is enough information to move to Phase II and that is the purpose of approaching the Flood Authority.

The purpose of the study was to look at water retention in the upper water shed, the Newaukum and the Chehalis, and two sites were selected. Those sites are above populated areas because areas that involve relocating people would be an issue. The technical and economic feasibility was looked into. Can they hold enough water to do any good for flood reduction, can they hold water in the spring for increased releases in the summer, and is there extra availability for hydro.

The PUD is prepared to provide additional detail about the people doing the Phase II study, the qualifications of those people, resumes, references, etc if the Flood Authority requests it.

Dr. John Henricksen encouraged the Authority to set aside politics and bias. This is about the flood basin and a river that does not know about politics, tribes, and biases. This resolution appears to cover every facet that the Authority has been asked to meet at this point; in other words, it talks about projecting into other studies and projects further down the Basin and One Voice believes that is extremely important.

Dr. Henricksen stated if the money that has been allocated to the Authority is not used fairly soon, that money will disappear.

The Bills passed last year set aside \$2.5 million specifically for the Authority. There was another \$47 million that is matchable money but it is misunderstood that that money can also potentially be used for projects in coordination with the Corps and outside the Corps if they choose not to use it. Retention and levees need to be done together because the flooding issue is too big for just one or the other. The project must be ready to present to the potential funders before any money is allocated.

While this is a huge project and the funding will be very difficult, it is not impossible, and Dr. Henricksen urged the Authority to continue developing the comprehensive plan of which Phase II can be a vital part and come up with a project that can be funded.

Mr. Tom Nicholas, Lewis County EDC, stated the EDC is actively engaged in working to ensure the success of local business as well as marketing to attract new business and industry into all areas of the County.

At a recent Board of Directors meeting, a decision was made to take a policy stand on the issues of flood control as it relates to the future of the economy within the Chehalis River Basin and in Lewis County. A summary of the list of actions that the EDC is interested in moving forward: support additional planning studies necessary for long-term solutions to flooding; develop relations with the Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority for innovative solutions to flooding issues; encourage continued study of the proposed PUD Phase II project.

The EDC supports careful planning and comprehensive results.

Ms. Vernadel Peterson, Centralia-Chehalis Chamber of Commerce, submitted a letter from the Board of Directors and highlighted some of the points in that letter. The Chamber encouraged the Authority's support in authorizing funding to proceed with the Lewis County PUD Phase II project.

Ms. Larissa Maughan, Adna resident, stated her family suffered emotionally and financially during both the 2007 and 2009 floods. She urged the Authority to not delay in considering the possibilities that could have the potential to help prevent flooding in the entire Basin.

Mr. Barry Panusch, Boistfort Valley, stated the 2007 flooding was worse than any flooding he had ever seen. In 1990 and 1996 he had no water in the house, which was built in the 1930's. In 2007 there was 8 feet of water in his house. He stated he is at the upper end of the Chehalis. It makes no difference how many box stores have been built, how much filling has been done. Boistfort and Curtis have not had any filling or any box stores. When he gets 8 feet of water then the people at the lower end of the Chehalis will get the water because it has to go someplace. He believes the dam will help hold some of that water back and would like to see this project moved forward.

Ms. Katherine Humphrey stated she farms her land and there was considerable erosion in 2009. She has worked with the Conservation District planting trees and shrubs and with Fish and Wildlife on a bio repair placing stumps and trees on the bank and they are all gone now. She does not think dredging or levees would help her but she believes the dam is the best solution for everyone in the Basin.

Ms. Heather Cox had pictures of her home from the 2007 flood which brought 56" of water into her house. Everything was lost, including business equipment. They were terrified it would happen again in 2009. She believes the dam will be very beneficial and encouraged the Authority to support the dam proposal.

Ms. Sue Rosbach stated her family has been on the same farm for over 100 years and has never had water in the house. She suffered considerable losses in 2007 at home and at

her workplace. She strongly urged the Authority to fund the study for Phase II. Retention of water at the top will prevent it from reaching Centralia, Chehalis, Oakville and beyond and can be released in the summer when it is needed for the fish.

Mr. Roger Rose submitted a letter which Ms. Rosbach read, stating the PUD Phase II project would answer questions and allow moving dirt to get a solution started. He encouraged the Authority to support the proposal.

Ms. Julie Gothard, Boistfort Valley, stated her family lost everything in the 2007 flood. She had three feet of water in her home and her neighbor had 8 feet; the further down the river the higher the water because the water backed up; it had nowhere to go. She urged the Authority to fund the Phase II project.

Mr. Arnold Haberstroh thanked the Authority for serving on the Board, which is closer than anyone has ever been to reaching a solution. The flooding did not affect his house but it did affect him as an individual. He asked the Authority to be open minded and to move forward.

Mr. Larry Dacca, Boistfort Valley, lives above the flooding, and has never seen flooding like he saw in 2007. He moved from the Puyallup Valley where he lived near the Mud Mountain Dam. That dam in connection with the levees allows the Fife, Puyallup and Tacoma areas to exist. The water in the Chehalis Basin can be retained as it is in the Mud Mountain Dam. He encouraged the Authority to move forward because it is on the right track.

Mr. Tony Schilter, Bunker Creek Rd, was shown the highest water mark when he bought his house and built above it. When they built his son's house they moved it up 3' from the high water level. In 2007 there was 6" of water in his son's house; the dairy had over four feet. His equipment suffered; he lost seven head out of 400. All the feed and grain was gone. He has experience with dams in Boistfort Valley and up north and urged the Authority to pursue the PUD plan.

Ms. Julie Powe, Chehalis, stated several citizens had asked her to speak on their behalf. They support the PUD plan but were unable to attend the daytime meeting.

Ms. Powe stated before the members vote today on this issue to ask themselves if there is a legitimate argument to vote down the proposal. Perhaps the members do not like the idea of water retention but she asked the members to consider it as part of the whole plan. Water retention cannot be considered until it is known if it will work, which is what Phase II will do. The decision must be based on facts not on feelings.

Some people think it will cost too much money; however that amount of money has been spent already. The cost of Phase II represents what some individuals lost in one flood.

Ms. Powe asked the Authority to see if this could be part of the big plan.

Mr. David Batker, Earth Economics, stated there are areas all over the world that had never experienced flooding and now they are. He agreed with the EDC suggesting comprehensive and innovative ideas. There is a study proposal supported by Grays Harbor and the Chehalis Basin Partnership and it is important to look at the full spectrum of both the built structures and the water retaining capacity of natural systems. In China they reimburse farmers for flood protection. The evaluation study would help prioritize flood studies and be more inclusive in the economic analysis. In the past a problem that has been experienced in the Northwest is looking at flooding without looking at the full impact on salmon, the full benefits to agriculture and development with cities that are within the watershed. It is important to identify the full set of benefits from a suite of options, to map those benefits, to value them and then look at prioritization of projects and funding mechanisms.

Earth Economics is a non-profit organization and has a \$900,000 National Science Foundation grant and is partnering with three or four watersheds. He believes this Basin has the right suite of problems and the process for solutions to do something innovative and comprehensive which has not been done in a lot of places.

6. Reports

a) Chairman's Report

Enclosed in the Member packets was a letter responding to the Cowlitz Tribe regarding membership in the Authority.

One project being considered in the Basin is the "Corps" project, or the Centralia-Chehalis protection project, which was approved in the Water Resources Development Act bill in 2007 in Congress but there was no money appropriated for that project. A bill just signed by President Obama has allowed that money, \$1,147,000, to be used toward the design phase of that project. In addition, the House added another funding source of \$574,000 to contribute to this Authority's project to come up with other Basin-wide solutions. That money has gone to the Corps of Engineers and there will be discussion with the Corps since studies in the federal structure require a 50/50 share. The \$574,000 will require a non-federal match. There will be a discussion with Congressman Baird's office for the next steps required.

A telephone survey was approved by the Authority and Chairman Averill asked Ms. Hoffman to report on that.

Ms. Hoffman stated the survey had been completed and the analysis of the results is now being tabulated. Initially a report was scheduled for this meeting; however because of the full agenda, the survey firm has been asked to present its findings at a work session. It is expected that Mr. Stuart Elway will give a draft report and ask the Authority if it wishes any additional analysis and he will then attend the April 16 meeting with the final report.

Chairman Averill stated in the Member packets were the questions submitted by Mr. White at February's meeting and answers to those questions from the PUD and the PUD's consultants.

b) Flood District Formation Update

Chairman Averill stated in the County's efforts of looking at the Flood Control District, it went to the Legislature and asked for some specific changes in the legislation for the formation of a Flood Control District under the current RCWs 86.09 and 85.38. The Senate Government Affairs Committee passed both recommended bills and the floor of the Senate passed both bills unanimously. This morning the House Government Affairs Committee heard one of the two bills, 5704, and Commissioner Grose from Lewis County and Commissioner Carter from Grays Harbor went to the Committee to testify. Commissioner Grose reported the testimony went well on 5704. In the packet is a synopsis of what came out of the Senate on both bills.

Chairman Averill stated a number of the Authority members have received electronic communications from people concerned about the project. He wanted to acknowledge that he had received quite a few also. There are letters in the packet from Gary Alexander asking that the Authority give consideration to the flood retention project. The Port of Chehalis also provided a letter similar to the letter from the Chamber which also urges the Authority's support of the project, as does a letter from the Industrial Commission, also included.

c) Member Reports

There were no member reports.

d) State Contingent Report

Mr. John Donahue spoke for Mr. Keith Phillips who could not attend the meeting. Mr. Phillips wanted to reiterate the understanding of the Governor's office of the magnitude of the problems and significance of the impacts as were heard today and in the past. There are a number of initiatives before the Authority that are critical to addressing these problems and the Governor's office supports the Authority and its role in considering these.

The Office also notes with interest the introduction of the funding for the basin-wide study through conventional funding and the opportunity this provides for partnerships and for leveraging funds and hopes the Authority is able to take advantage of that opportunity.

It is understood that the levee project, or the Twin Cities project, only addresses part of the solution and that is how the legislation that guides us tries to address how we treat it. We support you in your role and in addressing the issues, identifying and determining the studies and projects that need to get done and to engage in a process that reflects your mutual commitment and individual commitment to getting it done. It is important that the advantages of the studies remain accountable and transparent, that everyone can see what the results are and can appreciate what is being done.

The work with the Corps of Engineers is continuing to make progress on the scope, schedule and budget that is guiding our current phase, the design evaluation. We are at a

35% level that was approved in 2004. The goal of this evaluation is to establish whether the design is still feasible and still makes sense in light of new information, both hydrologic information and changes in economics. We will have a milestone report on the results of that later in the year.

The Coordination Team has not yet reconvened but the mutual commitment is for April and anyone is invited. The purpose of the Coordination Team is to monitor the progress of the Twin Cities project and understand certain decisions that are being made and to weigh in on those decisions. There will be a report from a State and local technical team meeting regarding product assumptions.

Ms. Laura Orr, Army Corps of Engineers, stated the Corps is continuing to work and move forward on the Twin Cities project. There is another project called the Chehalis Basin Eco System Restoration and a Flood Damage Reduction Project. Grays Harbor has been the Corps' non-federal sponsor for some time for the Eco System restoration. This is an avenue for the Corps to look at more innovative Basin-wide solutions. The Corps is happy to be involved in a dam project. As a Federal agency, the Corps requires a non-federal sponsor and we are hoping that we can work with the Authority to come up with a solution.

There are a lot of conditions that go along with obtaining Federal money and to make sure the Corps is involved in a project, so anything the Authority can come up with that the Corps can implement is Ms. Orr's concern. The Authority needs to understand it needs to get cost share so a project can be moved forward.

Ms. Orr stated a basin-wide solution is a great idea.

Chairman Averill stated item 7 had been discussed earlier by Ms. Hoffman.

8. Summary of Morning Work Session

a) Mr. Dave Carlton summarized the work session. There was a discussion on the decision-making process, reaching a consensus as a group and what to do if consensus was not reached.

b) The FloodPath presentation was discussed by Mr. Joseph Jones of USGS. FloodPath is a numerical model used to predict the timing and depth of floods based on the National Weather Service (NWS) predictions. This is a tool that can be used within the Emergency Management System to let people know when the flood is coming. It can be used for planning: where will it flood and what should be done if it does flood; what decisions should be made for land use.

Mr. Carlton asked the Authority if ESA Adolfson, as the consultant, should discuss this more with USGS and come back with a proposal or a staff report as to how the Authority could potentially be involved if it chooses to do so.

c) Mr. Carlton stated Ms. Root presented a status report on stream gauges. ESA has essentially completed its part of that report, specifically where the gauges are, who owns them, what kind of information you would like to get, where else do you want stream gauges and why do you want them. We recommend considering the development of a Basin-wide emergency management system based off of the stream gauge report and possibly hiring an expert to work with the emergency management division in each community so there is a coordinated system for flood warning throughout the Basin. Mr. Carlton would like direction on that.

Mr. Carlton stated Ms. Root also presented on the status of the project list. It has been divided up into projects and studies and then divided into what could potentially be ripe and ready studies that you may consider moving forward within the next month or so. Those are in your packet and you will discuss those later in the meeting.

There is a list of criteria that the consultants and the Board Advisory Committee (BAC) uses in trying to decide what could be ripe and ready studies. These include basin wide impacts. The criteria would be used to make decisions on actual projects, whether you get a cost share and is someone else willing to help fund the study. The USGS is willing to kick in some of their own money to get this study done. Another criterion is the process to go through for moving projects and studies off of a draft list onto a list where you will take action.

Chairman Averill stated another discussion during the morning work session were a number of items for an emergency management package: gauges, improvement of systems, etc. We need someone to put that package together to make a proposal. Chairman Averill asked the BAC and others with expertise in emergency management to look at this, prepare a proposal and bring it to the Authority at the April meeting.

Mr. Ron Schillinger made the motion, seconded by [unidentified]. Without objection the motion carried.

9. Expenditure Review

Mr. Bob Johnson stated the Expenditure Review was included in the packets. Expended to date: \$253,000; in March: \$82,700. There is still a little over \$1.9 million allocated for studies. It was considered to allocate some of that \$1.9 to continue the facilitation services. That decision needs to be made in the near future.

10. Public Meetings

Ms. Hoffman stated that originally in the scope of work ESA Adolfson had identified three points for public meetings: two were actually held, one in Chehalis and one in Montesano and another time was identified for April and another for June when there would be some draft recommendations needing feedback. The recommendation by the BAC and consultants is that there would not be a public meeting in April since two work sessions and one regular business meeting are scheduled for April and the Authority is not yet at the point of sharing products, recommendations or draft material to take to the public. The alternative is to put together a newsletter update that could go on the website

and to each agency to share with its constituents. This could also be shared with the media so the public is aware of upcoming meetings.

Commissioner Willis asked if the public meetings would be scheduled in two different locations the same as the previous meetings.

Ms. Hoffman recalled that was Commissioner Willis' recommendation and the others acknowledged that and there was a consensus on that issue.

11. USGS Presentation

Mr. Matt Ely, USGS, gave some background on what he has been doing with the Chehalis Basin Partnership. The Chehalis Basin Partnership is tasked with low flows, restoration work, fish habitat, the interaction of ground water and surface water and the effects of humans with ground water withdrawal and irrigation.

The piece of scientific work the USGS has done so far was in September of 2007 when it completed a Basin-wide seepage measurement to look at the interaction of ground water and surface water, where ground water is feeding the surface water: streams, rivers, and where the streams and rivers are feeding water back to your ground water system. It is one hydrologic cycle, but the water that starts in the top of the watershed and makes it to the ocean moves on different paths and different timing. Where that ground water feeds into the rivers can be an extremely important fish habitat. Where there is a close connection to ground water and surface water are places where development or changes in land use and land cover could have a larger impact on your rivers and streams.

During a three day period there were about 75 stream measurements taken. That work was published and there is an interactive Google map of stream measurement sites that links to our national data base. Besides the 20 stream flow gauges, we also have miscellaneous measurements taken during floods and at high and low flows that go back 100 years.

From that work, we submitted a fairly large proposal for a comprehensive water resource assessment on a Basin-wide scale. USGS does have money to share; however with a project of this magnitude, it is multi-year and multi-dollar. With the Partnership, we have been investigating various avenues to fund this work. The Department of Ecology was enthusiastic but not all the money we had hoped for is available for scientific studies.

The proposal was formally submitted by USGS a year ago and no funding sources have become available. We have submitted a smaller proposal to the Partnership with the hopes that it can be funded through some various programs. The study is to understand the interaction of surface water with ground water but also to understand the regional impacts, such as climate change, development, changes in land use and cover are going to have on the ground water system and the surface water system.

From the data we collect we build a quantitative numerical model used for decision supports. We run the model with various scenarios of new pumping, new irrigation

withdrawals etc. and look at the impact. It is a way for us to study what might happen to the system with the different management scenarios. We wanted to discover where the precipitation is, where is it falling and where is it entering the ground water system. We do this through a fairly complex watershed model, which simulates using land use, land cover, soils, topography, precipitation, air temperature, solar radiation. We build the model of how the water moves through the system and that output would normally feed into a ground water model. This is where we can begin to see an overlap in importance. The water that is so important at the one hydrologic extreme of flooding is also our source of water for the lowest of low flows. The model could be extremely important for things like simulating peak flows, changes in peak volumes, and it can feed into the other hydrologic models to look at sediment transport.

We have written a proposal on the Flood Authority form for this separate watershed model that would do a great service for the low flows for the critical habitat, and it could provide information in simulating past flows, current flows and the potential current future flows looking at different climatic scenarios. You can build a data set that is based on three day duration or a climate change that brings the same amount of precipitation but makes it shorter and with more intense storms. We can look at possible stream flows at various points along the river where you might want to build water retention facilities.

The website is wa.water.usgs.gov and there is a Chehalis page with some of the past work we have done with maps and data and other links that can provide further information.

Commissioner Willis asked if we were to build a dam within the watershed, how would the water we store affect where it should come out later. Would water be coming out somewhere where we didn't have it before because it went underground?

Mr. Ely stated if you make any changes to a system there are going to be changes upstream and downstream. With any decision, you must weigh the costs and benefits. When a water retention facility is built, there will be an affect: you've taken a river and you've made it a lake and that will change the way sediment is transported down the river. These are important things to understand. No one wants to do more damage than good with any water management decisions. Understanding the upstream and downstream affects of any water management scenario is very important. Some of these questions may be better suited to a ground water model.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked if Mr. Ely was specifically talking about #6 on the ripe and ready studies.

Mr. Ely stated USGS is proposing one part of that. A ground water model takes quite a bit of time and money to get the product finished. We have a couple of proposals to start building those pieces with the help of the USGS cooperative program to piece funding together. This would not include the final ground water model stage but we think we can get everything up to the ground water model and hope other funding sources become available for the final step.

Commissioner Valenzuela spoke of the phenomenon of water flowing backwards and asked if Mr. Ely knows why that occurs.

Mr. Ely stated that specific question might be better answered by the work Mr. Joseph Jones presented at this morning's work session. That is a 2-D flood model that receives as an input a flood forecast that the National Weather Service (NWS) conducts. The model Mr. Ely spoke of, running scenarios in the future, could feed that model. That would be the source of stream flow that would go into a flood path model for running stream flow and also a flood inundation model that would get to the reasons of backflow and working in the tides.

12. Resolution on Ripe and Ready Basin-Wide Studies

Chairman Averill stated the motion tabled at the last meeting will need to come off the table. There has been a considerable amount of discussion during that time and there has been a draft resolution prepared which is in the Member packets. The intent was to broaden the original motion insofar as this body is looking at Basin-wide solutions. We wanted to look at projects that not only have Basin-wide impacts, but to look at smaller projects further down the river, and there are other projects that might apply to the final listing of Basin-wide projects. We wanted to look at the PUD project as part of our task and also look at additional tasks proposed at the work session and at this meeting. Chairman Averill stressed that there is no intention to say one project is all the Authority will be involved in. This resolution has a mechanism for any project that is of interest.

If the maker of the motion, Chad Taylor, concurs then Chairman Averill suggests the motion is taken off the table and substitute this resolution for the original motion.

Mr. Taylor concurred. Mr. Thompson seconded.

Chairman Averill stated this body is 11 individual governmental jurisdictions and is operating as a cooperative group looking for a solution to a mutual problem, which is flooding in the Basin. It entered into an interlocal agreement stating the need to operate as much as possible from a position of consensus and subsequently adopted a model that was used by the Chehalis Basin Partnership. We did recognize there may be occasions when we cannot come to a consensus and if we cannot we require a super majority vote of 60% to come to a decision.

Chairman Averill stated there are several "whereas" in the resolution and asked if there are concerns about them. There were no comments and without objection the "whereas" were approved.

Chairman Averill moved to the "be it resolved" Items (1), (2), (3), (4) and (5).

Mr. Taylor spoke in favor of items 1-5. To Item 1, if the Flood Authority moves forward to Phase II and enters into an interlocal with the PUD there are some benefits to the Authority. The scope of work is completed, PUD has completed Phase I, there are no lengthy contract periods and bureaucratic processes to go through.

Chairman Averill explained that the Flood Authority is not a municipal corporation which means it does not have the authority to contract with people and it was for that reason that we wrote into the interlocal agreement that Lewis County would be the lead agency. Since Lewis County is a municipal corporation it can do that.

Mr. Schillinger stated the City of Montesano is in favor of Items 1-5.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked with whom the consultants, who do work on behalf of the Authority, contract.

Chairman Averill stated governments have to issue an RFQ or RFP (request for qualifications and request for proposals). We are also allowed to “piggyback” on an existing project which has already gone through that process. This is what we are suggesting here, because the PUD, as a municipal corporation, has already gone through the process of starting the study and hiring a qualified consultant to work on that study. We are suggesting that the Authority piggyback and Lewis County would technically be doing the contract but it would be for the Authority and would belong to the Authority.

Discussion followed regarding Item 1.

Mr. Dave Muller stated if the Authority does not wish to use EES Consulting the PUD would need to go out again for RFQ and go through the process again.

Commissioner Willis asked if the \$480,000 has to be in this section. What if it is more than that?

Mr. Muller stated changing the scope of work could result in more or less money.

Chairman Averill stated Commissioner Willis’ point is noteworthy. Perhaps the \$480,000 in this section might show up in the next “be it further resolved” because when we discuss entering into an agreement the details would be in there.

Commissioner Willis made motion to move the \$480,000 out of this paragraph and into the next “Be it further resolved” Item (1). Motion seconded by Jim Cook.

Mr. Cook asked how using another consulting firm would impact the project and time frame.

Mr. Muller stated the process to follow would be preparing an RFQ, response time to the RFQ, review of the responses, recommendations, and finally negotiation of price. This process would probably take 4-6 months.

Mr. Schillinger asked if Mr. Muller had gone through this already. Mr. Muller stated the PUD does it periodically so that it is not necessary to go through the process every time a project needs to be done. It was done in 2006.

Chairman Averill stated legal counsel informed the Authority that the interlocal agreement makes Lewis County more than a fiscal agent. Excerpts from the interlocal agreement state that Lewis County will negotiate and execute agreements with State agencies for funds and receive and disburse funds from the State and Federal agencies, in the event work must be performed by or on behalf of the counties or basin communities, solicit statements of qualifications, negotiate scopes of work and execute contracts to perform the work by or on behalf of the counties. The lead agency shall not obligate any of the Basin governments to any financial responsibilities without prior written approval and agreement from the appropriate Basin governments, and can provide legal support as necessary.

Chairman Averill stated if the dollar amount is moved to the next “be it resolved” we will need consensus on this item.

Mr. White proposed that the first task is funded for \$250,000, with caveats. The PUD must provide references and experience of EES and agree that the Authority has some oversight and that the Flood Authority owns all the data that comes out of the project. Mr. White and the Tribe have some hesitation with the Resolution but also understand that the Authority must move ahead quickly.

Commissioner Valenzuela suggested editing (1) if the dollar amount was to be taken out. She suggested “Authorizing Lewis County on behalf of the Flood Authority to enter into an interlocal agreement with Lewis County PUD to execute the Phase II study and scope of work.” She had no issue with Mr. White’s statement and she is comfortable with (1)(c) on page 2.

Commissioner Willis stated when we started this conversation we were going to do a basin-wide study. She has no problems going with the PUD study but she wants to be assured this study will be taken further into the Basin. She asked for an explanation as to the second part how this would get to the basin-wide study as far as water retention is concerned and where those funds will be coming from.

Chairman Averill stated when the second “be it resolved” is discussed, it will concern the process for subsequent projects. We will stipulate how those will come before this body for funding.

Ms. Lee Napier stated the nature of the Chehalis Basin Partnership’s proposal was to look at storage options throughout the basin and the way Item #2 is written now indicates it is complementing Item #1. The proposal is trying to get at other storage sites and it would be inconsistent to say we are going to give additional money to look at a site that has already been selected.

Chairman Averill asked if that could be resolved by saying “Phase II study and other storage options”.

Ms. Napier stated she would prefer it was stricken; it is looking at the feasibility of storage.

Mr. White asked if the Phase II study could be changed to “could compliment other water retention alternatives”.

Ms. Napier stated yes. The reason this is being proposed by the Chehalis Basin Partnership is we have \$230,000 to augment instream flows. We would ask that the Authority match that money to deal with flood control. The Partnership would bring that back to the Authority.

Chairman Averill stated without objection the new wording is approved in Item #2.

Commissioner Willis asked if the Authority is satisfied with the wording in Item #4.

Ms. Laura Orr stated this is the Chehalis Basin Partnership and when the Corps signs an agreement it is with a non-federal sponsor: a city, a county, tribe or a local agency. When we negotiate the design agreement and the project management plan it would be through that non-federal sponsor. Grays Harbor is the sponsor for the eco-system restoration project and the Corps would need an entity for the flood damage reduction project. When we are discussing this project, do we contact the Flood Authority to attend meetings or will a sub-committee be assigned?

Chairman Averill stated that issue could not be resolved at this meeting but within the next week or two the stakeholders could be brought to the table to work out those details.

Ms. Martin referred to Item #3. She wanted to ensure this means the Basin and not just the Chehalis River.

Chairman Averill stated this is regarding the Northwest Hydrologic Study and it has to take in the tributaries since they feed into the main stream.

Mr. White asked if “and tributaries” could be added.

Chairman Averill stated that should be added. Item #5 should read “projects” rather than “project”.

Without objection, the first “be it resolved” and all items were adopted, with changes.

Chairman Averill asked for recommendations for the “further resolved”. The dollar amount must be included in this section.

Mr. White requested the money be limited to \$250,000 at this time.

Ms. Hoffman suggested if it is agreed to have a sub-committee develop and recommend the interlocal agreement that the Authority uses the \$250,000 as a cap for a first phase

and the sub-committee would work with Lewis County and the PUD to define what is in that first phase and what would constitute a reporting back to have a milestone at the end and progress beyond that subject to Authority approval.

Mr. Muller stated task one is the engineering and site evaluation. Task three is the fish and wildlife investigation. He suggested funding the \$250,000 and work concurrently on phase I and III to avoid using many months to complete I and then another 8-10 months to complete III.

Mr. Taylor suggested setting the dollar limit and naming a sub-committee to determine how that money is spent.

After discussion, suggested wording for Item #1 was: The Flood Authority will appoint a sub-committee comprised of three board members to develop and recommend the interlocal agreement for accomplishing the scope of work for the Phase II feasibility study, with initial funding not to exceed \$250,000, and with additional funding as required to be approved by the Flood Authority.

Mr. White suggested: authorizing the \$250,000, run both studies concurrently; when the \$250,000 cap is reached the sub-committee can authorize additional funding.

Mr. Taylor stated reports would be given by the sub-committee, which is appointed by this Board, as to additional funding required by Lewis County for the PUD Phase II study, barring any fatal flaws.

Commissioner Willis asked if rewording was required since fish will be considered in Phase III.

Commissioner Averill stated it is Task 3 of Phase II.

Mr. Schillinger stated it was not in the original proposal. The discussion was the sub committee would do the scope of work not to exceed \$250,000 and that is where it would get ironed out.

Mr. Muller understood the \$250,000 would be for Phase II. Underneath Phase II are four tasks. 1- engineering, geotechnical studies; 2- regulatory permitting; 3- fish, environment; 4- update benefit cost. He suggested the \$250,000 be used concurrently for Tasks 1 and 3 because those are the longer lead items.

Chairman Averill stated Tasks 1 and 3 should be included in the motion.

Mr. Schillinger stated they were not because that is what the sub-committee would determine.

Commissioner Willis asked if contracts needed to be included in paragraph (b).

Commissioner Valenzuela stated we do not have to agree; it states the agreement will ensure the Flood Authority's guidance, oversight and ownership of the study, models and data. If there is any disagreement about any issues it is up to the sub-committee, the PUD and the Authority to work that out. She suggested that in (b) to delete the phrase "provided by the Lewis PUD" because there may be some negotiation on the scope of work.

Mr. Taylor disagreed stating the scope of work is the most important part.

Chairman Averill stated whether or not we change the PUD study, we are doing it under the auspices of a PUD negotiated contract and we are piggybacking on that contract.

There was agreement that the wording would be left as is.

Chairman Averill asked if there was agreement on the changed wording in section 1 to include the \$250,000. Without objection, that section was adopted.

Section 2 is the process that would be used for subsequent contracts; for example, there may be the need to extend the hydrologic model down the Basin. There needs to be an agreement to do that and this section would describe the procedure.

Mr. Schillinger stated the Board Advisory Committee (BAC) had originally been called the technical staff and he recommended changing that to Board Advisory Committee.

Chairman Averill stated we would be going one step further. The BAC might come to the Authority with a recommendation that we do a project or a member might have a recommendation. We would appoint a sub-committee from this group to do the oversight.

Ms. Hoffman stated the Authority would appoint a sub-committee to come up with a proposal and a scope of work for those studies, such as #3, developing an accurate hydrologic model, which would be subject to scoping, development of a budget and a way to undertake and accomplish the work.

Mr. White asked why another sub-committee would be formed when we know our best staff on the BAC can do this. He would rather see the BAC create a scope of work rather than the members. He asked if #2 could be stricken.

Commissioner Willis stated there is always the opportunity to bring technical people to the BAC if the need arises.

Mr. Carlton stated the role of the BAC and consultant is whatever the Authority designates. The Authority can create a sub-committee or it can delegate work to the BAC and the consultant.

Mr. White asked if (b) could be stricken and add this to the BAC role.

Mr. Carlton stated that could be done.

Mr. Bob Johnson stated he had no objection and once the BAC is done flushing everything out, the BAC would make that recommendation to a sub-committee or to the full Committee with scope of work, etc.

Chairman Averill stated there are subsequent projects that may have the same concern of the Authority and the desire to have tighter control; there may be some existing mechanism of using our staff to do that. Depending on the project, it could go either way.

Mr. Bill Bates agreed with Mr. White stating he saw no need for #2. The BAC is very capable.

Commissioner Valenzuela suggested leaving #2 and striking a, b, c, d, e. #2 would read "The Flood Authority shall direct its BAC to work with technical staff and Authority consultants to develop, review and refine scopes of work..." That would give the Authority the ability to assign certain items on the ripe and ready projects for the BAC to move forward on.

Following discussion, Mr. Carlton stated each time a sub-committee is created it must be facilitated, it must be staffed, and there is the possibility of running up against the capacity of the consultants in the current contract to be able to provide that support.

Mr. Johnson stated the intent of #2 is to direct the BAC to do something, and that is not to make decisions but to make recommendations to the Authority for contracts including scopes of work.

Ms. Hoffman stated the technical staff wording is redundant because the Authority has already asked the consultants to bring appropriate staff from other jurisdictions and technical expertise for the work that is done on behalf of the Authority.

Without objection, paragraphs a, b, c, d, and e were stricken.

#2 will read: The Flood Authority shall direct the BAC to work with technical staff and Authority consultants to review and refine scopes of work and cost estimates of any studies and subsequently provide recommendations to the Authority.

Chairman Averill suggested he and Pat Anderson work on the wording. Hearing no objection it was adopted. Revised wording is attached to these minutes.

Chairman Averill stated that completed the changes to the resolution and entertained a motion to approve. Mr. Taylor moved, [unidentified] seconded. Without objection the resolution was adopted.

Ms. Hoffman stated if the Authority wished to appoint a sub-committee for the Phase II study this would be the appropriate time.

Chairman Averill recommended Commissioner Bill Schulte (alternate for Lewis County), Commissioner Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County and someone to be designated from the Chehalis Tribe. Without objection the recommendation was adopted.

13. Confirm Next Meeting and Board-Requested Topics

Ms. Hoffman stated the next business meeting for the Authority is scheduled for Thursday, April 16 at 1:30. The next work session, an additional work session, will be on Thursday, April 2, at 1:30 P.M. at the Veterans Museum. The regular work session will be on April 16 at 9:00 A.M. at the Veterans Museum.

Ms. Hoffman updated the Authority on Mike Sharar's progress. Mike left the hospital last Thursday and is now at St. Peter's in-patient rehab undergoing rehab and making progress.

14. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:53 P.M.