

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

**May 21, 2009 – 9:00 A.M.
Meeting Notes**

1. Convene Work Session

Chairman Averill called the meeting to order at 9:13 am.

2. Introductions

Introductions were made by all attending.

3. Economic Recovery from 2007 Flood

Chairman stated a request was made by Wahkiakum Council of Governments (WCOG) after the 2007 flood. The Cowlitz/Lewis Economic Development District (EDD) chartered a study about the types of economic measures to help businesses that were damaged by the flood. After 1.5 years the study has been provided to the boards of Lewis and Cowlitz Counties and the results have been implemented. While this study is primarily oriented at Lewis County what has been done in the study may be attractive to Thurston County and Grays Harbor County.

Mr. Steve Harvey said the COG began bringing together a regional transportation plan with five counties. Individually the counties could not meet the criteria to apply for the funding. In 1992 an interlocal was signed by Lewis County to join with the other four counties. At same time we were invited by EDCs to look at arrangements to address impacts. Out of that came recommendations by Eric Hovee to address the policy decisions.

A comprehensive economic development strategy has been compiled and part of that was a request by the EDC to look at impacts from the 2007 flood as related to economic impacts and what strategies could be devised to address those impacts. A similar thing was done in 1995 and 1996 for the five-county area. This particular storm, whose origins were in Lewis County, had no focus on Cowlitz County at all. The damages done by the December snow storm and January flooding impacted both counties.

The document in today's packet gives an overview of those damages. A series of recommendations came out of this. It provides recommendations for developing lands that are not so prone to flooding and land use classifications. It focuses on: long term land use changes; changes to interchanges, including the Winlock/Toledo area which is out of the flood zone and there is a need for industrial use there; the Grand Mound area connecting with the Port of Centralia facilities and the Trans Alta land bank. There are also recommendations on how to pursue funding: categorical grant funding, stimulus funds, state funding.

The focus in Phase II is to create greater ground assistance working with chambers of commerce in Lewis County and Cowlitz County to provide assistance to local businesses and local awareness and preparation and how the businesses can overcome those. Some of these ideas include record keeping, inventory management, etc. We propose that chambers and EDCs have coordinators working with these groups to conduct work shops and one-on-one sessions to develop better knowledge by business owners to make them more resilient for future disasters. We will also look at every day hazards moving up the rail corridor and I-5. There needs to be a way to protect the business community no matter what type of disaster occurs.

The next phase would be to develop business coaches. Some models have worked in small communities. After coordinating phase and training, you develop some expertise in communities and can assist like businesses to establish new ones or give additional help for mitigation. This is being done in Vernonia, OR, where much of the town was wiped out during the last flood. In some places entire communities were displaced. Another approach is hiring individuals to work with the community. There is always the competitive advantage/disadvantage issue here. Would one business want a similar business to come in and look at their operations?

We are putting together a grant application to fund those positions. Our involvement is in the administrative and bookkeeping end.

Chairman Averill suggested Lewis and Thurston Counties might want to see the larger report and asked for an arrangement to get copies.

Mr. Harvey stated the statute requires multi-county participation. Thurston could join with either EDD.

4. Recommended Actions

Ms. Ann Root presented a PowerPoint on items that would go into the Plan and the draft outline.

Recommended Actions Chapter

- 1 – Introduction
- 2 – Selection Criteria
- 3 – Major Regional Capital Projects
- 4 – Local Capital Projects (a large number of projects that do not have a regional benefit have local benefits)
- 5 – Nonstructural Programmatic Actions

Q – Are we going to look at prioritization?

A – Probably not between now and June but after June that will be a big task. Ms. Hoffman stated the Authority won't be in a position to prioritize the regional projects until after the studies and feasibilities analysis are done. As far as local projects, we would anticipate some prioritization of what the Flood Authority wants to support to consider matching funds. We are thinking in terms of discussion and some decision

making around some local projects where you give us a reaction and then continue in June and after June.

Recommended Approach for May and June

These items were briefly defined.

Draft Criteria for Evaluating Projects

Project Definition: Has the project been sufficiently defined and scoped to be considered and evaluated as a potential project by the Flood Authority? *Dave Carlton address who gets the benefit.*

- Ability to Meet Goals
- Effectiveness of Mitigation: What flood hazard problems does the project solve? Is it a permanent or temporary solution? Is it a complete or partial solution? *Bill Schulte: Percentage of area impacted; Chairman Averill: Corps is looking at impact of its project downstream so there is no appreciable impact of levees downstream. Ann stated we can work in some area component.*
- Feasibility
- Cost and funding Sources
- Cost Effectiveness
- Implementing Agency
- Environmental Impacts
- Permitting Ease
- Timeliness
- Acceptability

Mr. Carlton stated you may be looking at comparing a large project with a bunch of little projects because of funding. We need to understand benefits of all the projects and come up with packages of what you want to fund.

Commissioner Willis stated if we run out of money the small projects may not exist. Ms. Hoffman stated that is the decision of the Flood Authority.

Mr. Carlton stated hopefully the small ones can have a match provided by getting a grant because the big projects don't address the situation.

Chairman Averill suggested establishing an inventory funding availability. Perhaps a project is high on our list to accomplish but we don't have funding and we need to get the funding.

Ms. Hoffman stated these are not criteria to set up a waiting system. They are framed as questions: yes or no or information about the project. They are considerations but they do not say within the criteria that you should more highly prioritize a basin-wide solution over another. If you want to you can develop the criteria further. At this point the criteria are framed as information about each project in order to compare them and to make decisions.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated each project should be evaluated for downstream impacts, good or bad.

Chairman Averill stated it should include upstream and downstream. Regarding the final two criteria, timeliness and acceptability, Chairman Averill is concerned about them. How long does it take to implement a project? Large ones take a long time, which is not necessarily good or bad.

Mr. Carlton stated regarding timeliness, big projects may take a long time so is there something you want to do in the meantime? It is better to acknowledge this right away.

Discussion followed and it was decided to change "criteria" to "factors for consideration".

Commissioner Willis stated on the cost and funding sources, you added "and maintain". One factor to consider is not only maintenance but who might be in charge of the maintenance.

Ms. Root stated the implementing agency covers that. We could add "maintain" besides take the lead.

Chairman Averill stated the evaluation for acceptability can be informative or objective. He asked if there is a process being used as to what we use to evaluate?

Ms. Root stated these criteria will go into the draft plan. There needs to be a next stage as we revise the plan to get more specifically into evaluation criteria format. That is as far as the plan has gone.

Ms. Hoffman stated some evaluation systems have points and weighting or ranking to quantify against each project. Some provide information and data and yes or no answers and then you use that to make a ranking, but it is not as quantified. She asked if there was a preference.

Chairman Averill believes a mathematical weight put on criteria is disastrous. When you ask GMA what they are looking for they are not consistent between three boards.

Commissioner Willis stated she has not had much experience with GMA but has numbered criteria and found the more of the projects you have or more considerations you make the numbers help send you in the right direction to give you a point of action. She likes numbers for a tool.

Ms. Root stated the Tribe has the same sort of criteria and they are ranked low, medium and high.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated for most projects mentioned this problem will end up being resolved through a combination of projects and the sum will be greater than its parts. It speaks against weighting because it will be a creative combination of big and small things that will get the biggest rating. She would not like to be saddled with numbers; she is looking for maximum flexibility.

Chairman Averill stated Lee Napier has worked quite a bit on spending on salmon projects. How does that work?

Ms. Napier stated the Partnership weighted the criteria and ran it through a model and asked questions of each project. It was a long process but we were able to evaluate each project. We were able to modify the conditions; if you needed another ranking to meet another condition you could tweak the ranking. We started out with 18 projects and came up with top 5.

Ms. Hoffman stated there is some interest in a quantifiable analysis and to not be binding but have a flexible tool. We could propose a system where there is an initial step where you would rank numerically and there must be a way to consider projects in relationship to another by building a suite of scenarios. There must be a way to consider that so the decision making isn't done solely on a numerical solution but informed by it. We could come back to you with a proposed system.

Major Regional Capital Projects

- Options
- Studies to support decision-making
- Decision-making strategy flow chart on timeline

Ms. Hoffman stated we tried to come up with a vehicle to describe the path forward for making decisions on capital projects, such as the Skookumchuck Dam, Twin Cities levee, etc. How does the Flood Authority get the right information on the table at the right time to make decisions on what major regional projects the Authority wants to support and also do some mix and match between and among those projects. There may be elements of one project that match up with another. Certain aspects of the Twin City project may match up with upstream storage. We need to know how to look at those relationships to make decisions.

She tried to show two tracks heading to decisions of projects to pursue. The chart shows projects on the table now.

On the accompanying sheet she had a timeline for various ripe and ready studies. By the third quarter of 2010 decision making should begin.

Our interest today is getting feedback on options and timing and whether this jibes with how the Flood Authority makes decisions and if it captures the path forward.

Chairman Averill stated the objective of the Flood Authority is to assist three counties and the Tribe and whether we want to go ahead with a flood control district.

Ms. Hoffman stated this was mentioned by nearly everyone as a work element of the Flood Authority and needs to be front and center. We did not include it before because this was around the decision on regional capital projects. It is clear that the Flood Authority members want it to be a major work element and as such we can include it.

Commissioner Willis stated the studies that came up after last month's meeting was woody debris and aggregate within the system. Would these go under one of these other categories? This information would be helpful to other projects. We don't know what the inventory of gravel and woody debris are within the system and some projects could be affected by those numbers.

Mr. Carlton stated we do not have an inventory supply.

Mr. White stated the Department of Natural Resources has a woody debris supply.

Ms. Hoffman stated this is something we need to work on and see the status of the DNR work and what would be involved as a ripe and ready study to support the decision making.

Q - What about building in the floodplain?

A - We propose you have that in your plan so it's a matter of knowing where to put it on the list.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated a major element of the work element of a flood control district needs to be something like a public education campaign. People are looking at the Flood Authority to prevent floods this winter and we have not done a good job about educating the people about the length of time for doing this.

Commissioner Willis stated they are looking for results and we must get the information out that the results will take time.

Chairman Averill stated good warning and the opportunity to prepare is a benefit besides prevention.

Ms. Hoffman asked if the chart represents the vision of moving towards decisions. It was agreed that with additions, yes. The more we use this as a vehicle with the Flood Authority and partners and communities to describe the process it helps people understand what we are shooting for and how to get there.

Local Capital Projects

- Decision-making process and considerations
- Projects to fund

- Projects to support
- Projects to consider in the future

Draft Criteria (Considerations) for Local Capital Projects to Fund

- Address the general project considerations
- Can be implemented at relatively low cost
- Can be accomplished in the next year or two
- Provide relief from flood damage
- Potentially eligible for funding partnerships in the near future.

Q - What about considerations around habitat impacts.

A - One of the goals addresses that in the plan.

Chairman Averill stated we don't see here what the cost of any project is going to be and he suggested looking at what other funding sources are available besides through the Flood Authority. The funding we are currently working under through House Bills 3374 and 3375, about \$47 million, is tied up with the Twin Cities mitigation project. Until we put a shovel in the ground that is a set-aside. With the \$2.5 million for the Authority, it is possible we have built up credits and we may get more money but it will not be a huge amount. We do have alternatives to ask for additional relief. For example, the Adna project, the Corps has funding sources for which that project might be eligible, or a cost share project. Does the Adna project complement and fit in with the Twin Cities project so we would call it a Flood Authority project.

Ms. Hoffman talked with Keith Phillips about the possibility of accessing a small amount of the \$47 million to match funding for local projects. The community and the Flood Authority are interested in being able to have action taken sooner rather than later, not having to wait for results of the larger regional capital projects but get relief in local projects. Is it possible to use some of the \$47 million for match? He said technically yes, politically, maybe, it depends on what small number of projects you would put forward, other available funds, benefits of projects, and whether it would be perceived as substantially reducing the Twin Cities project. He was encouraging of the Flood Authority's consideration to the extent that there are two or three projects that have funding partnerships. He thought there may be room for consideration for that. It would be helpful if the entire Flood Authority put those forward and the local delegation was supportive of it. He encouraged looking broadly in the basin for those projects.

Ann – pull in from ripe and ready if there are impacts.

Potential Local Capital Projects

- Adna Levee improvement
- Relief culvert for north side runoff in Oakville
- Culvert replacements at State Street over Harris Creek in Oakville
- Sickman-Ford Bridge culverts
- Improvements to Sickman-Ford Bridge
- Install culverts under Main St. in Bucoda

- Protect Montesano waste water treatment plant
- Hospital access in Centralia *(This will probably be taken care of when the Mellen Street project is completed in 2012. Chairman Averill stated this is funded already)*

Mr. Schillinger stated the protection of the Montesano treatment plant could be crossed off the list. The City met the May 1 deadline for the mitigation grant application.

Mr. Carlton stated you have not received the grant yet and you need a 12% match. It should be kept on the list.

There was discussion regarding the Mary's River Lumber bank protection. This project has gone through a lot of meetings with permitting people meeting and getting feedback. It needs to be added to the list. It will probably be a \$1 million project but that amount has gone up and down.

Ms. Hoffman stated we are trying to narrow down to a certain number of projects you want to consider further in the local capital project list for shorter term funding and consider further in June and after.

Commissioner Willis stated the PDA is an excellent place to take care of emergency predicaments; they have power when other power goes out. If the road goes under water and we can't get anyone there. She would like a feasibility study for road work to make that area available to us and she understands it might not be possible.

Ms. Hoffman stated time is a problem today. She asked that everyone look at local projects and we will come up with a prioritizing methodology. See if there is something you want us to do work on to see if they are ripe or meet short term requirements.

Mr. White stated the Sickman-Ford Bridge can be taken off the list.

Nonstructural Programmatic Actions

- Regulatory programs
- Planning and data collection
- Education and public information
- Emergency response
- Flood damage reduction – elevating properties, etc., property buyouts
- Natural resource protection
- Forest practices

5. Break

The meeting recessed for ten minutes.

6. Land Use Regulatory Program

The memo in the packet outlines the reasons for what we propose and the next steps for evaluating this. We have heard concerns about development impacts, adequacy of existing regulations and options. We presented in Chapter 3 a summary of regulations which meet the minimum standard by DOE but we are hearing there are concerns that the level of protection vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. We are proposing the Flood Authority authorize the BAC to work on improving the inventory of land use regulations and look at options for other land use protection mechanisms. This could benefit the planning and building staffs and consultants would staff the committee and lend their experience for this. We have outlined specific tasks on page 2 for looking at this process.

Ms. Hoffman stated we recognize that land use authority is in the hands of individual jurisdictions. We are not suggesting that the Flood Authority should or could come up with actions that would change that authority. We are suggesting that the Authority can play a roll in recommending best practices and that can be educational for everyone. By providing pros and cons of various approaches and regulatory changes it would help the jurisdictions themselves. By the consultant and BAC taking this on, the BAC would need to be added to by the city jurisdictions who have not been participating so far. A workshop could bring in building and planning departments. We talked about having a Flood Authority sub committee work on it but did not know if the Flood Authority members would have the time. We came up with the idea of an expanded BAC to research the inventory and options and gather information and then work with the Flood Authority.

Chairman Averill stated we need to provide major cities who write their own hazard management plan with a mechanism to draw those in. Centralia just approved theirs. Another aspect is the Board Advisory Committee is not just the three or four people who we see on it; it is the jurisdictions' experts for whatever we are looking at. Besides building and planning you may want to have public works people included.

The Flood Authority has been developing a FHMP as a process and looking at it as a model and it could be adopted by the local authorities up and down the basin. If each jurisdiction cooperates, they would fall into their roles that the plan calls for and adopt it or include it in their plan. Building in a floodplain is a component of that.

Mr. Schillinger asked if there would be a progress report on the agenda for this afternoon.

Commissioner Averill stated perhaps on the June agenda.

Ms. Hoffman asked if talk about land use regulations should be pursued.

Chairman Averill stated yes, the issues are huge. Would like to think you could use best science or common sense but you do have the research and the practical and scientific side. Oftentimes that gets thrown out the window because "we live here and we are impacted so let's agree with what the rules ought to be" and science gets thrown out.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked why Thurston County and Grays Harbor County would agree to anything in the third county if their regulatory practices differ so much that it could be damaging to a tri-county co-op. This makes her think of the value of a more uniform approach.

Chairman Averill stated there are quite a lot of differences between the plans. Each jurisdiction has a plan and Lewis County has a plan. The City of Aberdeen is creating a CAO. People do not understand coordination of documents by various entities. You have to come back with coordination with that document and developmental regulations, etc.

Ms. Hoffman asked if everyone is comfortable with this approach. It is clear that the final product should include Flood Authority recommendations on best land use regulatory processes.

7. Flood Problem Areas

The draft of Chapter 6 is in the packet. Please get comments back to ESA Adolfson.

Commissioner Willis suggested acronyms go away because not everyone understands them. Ms. Root stated there will be a glossary and a list of acronyms when the document is final.

8. ESA Adolfson Proposed Contract Amendment

Items covered in the scope of work included in the member packet:

- What will have been accomplished by June 30, 2009;
- What decisions and actions need to be taken by the Authority in the next 12-18 months;
- What work elements should the FA work plan include for the next 12-18 months.

Mr. Carlton stated our proposal is designed to help you. We are interested in reaching consensus on what we are going to do for basin wide projects.

Commissioner Willis asked if we decide what the regulations could be why should we spend the money first without knowing if there will be a flood control district?

Mr. Carlton stated the Flood Authority could have conditions. The budget is for next year and things will come up that we had no idea we would need to address. There is flexibility built in for this.

Chairman Averill stated the flood control district will go before the voters. It will be difficult to get a positive vote unless people know what the district will do. A lot of work is still in progress. Part of that are the projects that the Flood Authority will do; we need to explain why we need a district. The Flood Hazard Management Plan will set the plan of work.

Mr. Carlton stated the FHMP are continuously updated, probably every 5 years. It becomes a living document of what we are doing now. The chapter of recommended actions is changed because of the work you have done, etc.

Regarding facilitation, Mr. White stated the consultants should run the meeting. There is still political unease going on between jurisdictions. Do we need a Chair and Vice Chair – can ESA facilitate? Would that add cost or is it possible?

Mr. Carlton stated ESA can perform that function if you want. Ms. Hoffman stated we have fit in what was asked for in the RFQ which is facilitation and coordination. The Bylaws established the Chair and Vice Chair.

Chairman Averill stated between the work sessions and business meetings we are making decisions at business meeting. None of us can make decisions for each jurisdiction. If there is a commitment to be made it must fit and then we are committing our governing body.

Mr. White stated he did not see how that will change.

Commissioner Willis stated the afternoon meetings are public meetings and are official. She was not sure if that has anything to do with it.

Ms. Martin stated we chose a Chair because Lewis County is the lead and has more of a working knowledge. We take information to our jurisdictions for decisions.

Mr. Schillinger stated Phase II will be done by the end of June. The contract is for \$325,000 from January to June. When will we know better if we are over and under that amount?

Discussion followed. Mr. Carlton stated the contract does not need to be voted on today. Commissioner Valenzuela wants to know who we are working with; Mike Sharar has not been replaced. There is a 15-day termination contract. We would like to know in June who the new person will be.

Mr. Carlton stated a lot of money was spent in March and there will not be so much work to do in the next couple of months. By the end of June there will still be some money left in our contract. The Flood Authority has a larger budget than just for ESA. This is an amendment to our existing contract and can be changed again.

Ms. Julie Powe stated early on in the meetings there was only Mike and one other person. Now there are four people at every meeting. Can that be streamlined?

Mr. Johnson stated ESA has sharpened its pencil and has reduced a large amount of staff time. A lot of it is a natural progression; part of staff is working on FHMP and that will be reduced. The initial set up and learning how to work together takes a larger chunk of time. To Dave's credit, he did cut back a lot.

Ms. Martin recommended holding public meetings in the fall because a lot of people will not be available in the summer months.

9. Adjourn

Adjournment was at 12:03P.M.

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

**May 21, 2009 – 1:30 P.M.
Meeting Notes**

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

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from April 16, 2009 work session and business meeting
- Ripe and Ready Projects Update
- Expenditure Review
- Memo re: Officer Elections
- Memo: Public USACE Twin Cities Flood Damage Reduction Project Public Event Information
- Memo: Flood Authority Work by ESA Adolfson July 1, 2009 – Dec 31, 2010
- OFM Interlocal Agreement
- Personal Services Agreement with ESA Adolfson
- Draft Rules of Procedure

1. Call to Order

Chairman Averill called the meeting to order at 1:36 P.M.

2. Introductions

Board members and attendees introduced themselves.

3. Review and Approval of Agenda

There were no changes or additions to the Agenda and it was approved.

4. Approval of Meeting Notes

The Chair asked for corrections or additions to the meeting notes. Hearing none they were approved.

5. Public Comment

Ms. Julie Powe stated the morning work session was very positive and everyone interacted well with each other.

Ms. Powe stated Chairman Averill and Vice Chair Mark White complement each other and she would like to see them re-elected. She strongly disagreed that the voting should be by secret ballot. With a Board such as the Flood Authority where voting on issues is generally by consensus everything should be kept open and on the table, otherwise secrecy builds distrust and it is in everyone's best interest to keep everything above board.

6. Reports

a) Chairman's Report

Chairman Averill provided the final resolution on the PUD Phase II project. There is a copy that was passed by the Flood Authority in the member packets, and also the Resolution that the Lewis County Commissioners passed as Lead Agent. If anyone wants a signed copy of the Resolution, please let Pat Anderson know and she will get it to you.

The Chehalis Basin Partnership had a briefing at one of its meetings, the State of the River Fiscal Report for 2008, and Ms. Lee Napier has copies of this if anyone is interested. There is also a power point that is available.

Chairman Averill was informed by Representative Baird's office about a State Emergency Management meeting with training sessions coming up on June 1 and June 3 in Everett and Camp Murray respectively. It is hosted by the State Emergency Management Division and FEMA to benefit cost analysis workshops designed to help potential project applicants develop cost effective project applications for the DR 1817 and 1825 Hazard Mitigation Grant program.

The Chair received information from Kathy Greer, Grays Harbor County, about a local marine resources community workshop and forum on Saturday, June 20 from 10:00 to 2:00 at the Aberdeen Rotary Log Pavilion.

At the last meeting, the Board added to the Rules of Procedure five items on Process and Procedure Guidelines which the Board voted to adopt into the Rules of Procedure. Chairman Averill would like everyone to have a final copy of that document.

Chairman Averill stated that during the 2007 flood one of the communities that had significant flooding is the unincorporated town of Adna. The Corps of Engineers looked at the damage and put together a proposal to provide some fixes to assist that community. There will be a meeting between the Corps, the County and the State Parks and Recreation. The meeting will be at the Courthouse at 1:00 on June 5.

Ms. Linda Hoffman stated a May update was e-mailed to the Flood Authority. It is ESA Adolfson's hope to produce these updates monthly as a tool to use in keeping your colleagues and councils updated as to what is going on with the Flood Authority. It is on the web page for the Flood Authority.

Ms. Hoffman stated the web page has been revised so it is more accessible and user friendly for anyone wanting information about the Flood Authority. Agenda topics,

memos, resolutions, etc can all be found there. The intent is that the monthly updates and the re-formatted website will enable better communication with the public on the activities of the Flood Authority.

b) Flood District Formation Update

Chairman Averill stated that during the legislative session we asked Senator Swecker to sponsor two statute changes for us. One of those would have increased the number of commissioners in a tri-county or larger flood control district. The legislation was made purposely not to identify a flood control district of just Grays Harbor, Lewis and Thurston Counties but to set that for any district that had three or more counties involved. The first piece of legislation was to provide for better representation in such large districts insofar as the current statute only allows three commissioners and does not specify any jurisdictions that they would have to represent. We drafted a bill that would have provided three commissioners that would represent the County area, two commissioners that would represent the urban areas in the two largest counties, and a provision to allow the Tribe to have a commissioner. In our case, we would have six commissioners in the district. Unfortunately that legislation bogged down and did not get passed in this session. Senator Swecker told Chairman Averill he has had discussions with various people and is willing to re-enter this into the legislature for the January session and believes there will be a better chance of passing it at that time.

The second piece of legislation that Senator Swecker sponsored pertained to forming a flood control district and who could vote to form that district. The current legislation provides property owners with some rather elaborate formulas for the number of votes that the property owner would have and who would be allowed to vote. We asked the legislature to allow for large districts of three or more counties to use registered voters rather than property owners. That legislation passed and was signed by the Governor on April 20 and becomes effective on July 26, 2009. If we move forward to form a flood control district we could hold that vote by registered voters. A copy of that legislation has been provided to the Flood Authority, Substitute Senate Bill 5705.

Chairman Averill stated a few things still need to be done to form a flood control district and it will not occur in 2009. We still must identify borders and this Flood Authority needs to come up with a plan as to what that district will do. Since this type of measure requires official action on the part of the three Counties and cooperation with the Tribe, those bodies will have to meet to make those decisions. We are continuing the process of putting everything together. An overall briefing of the Flood District as it is to date will be on the agenda for the June meeting.

The County engineers of Lewis, Thurston and Grays Harbor met to begin the process of identifying the border and the Tribe has been invited to participate as well.

c) Member Reports

Mayor Schillinger, Montesano, stated Mark Stewart of the State Emergency Management made a presentation at the work session in April on mitigation grants available through FEMA. The City of Montesano has applied for a grant for a sea wall around the waste water treatment plant.

d) Correspondence

USGS briefed the Flood Authority on their flood path project and requested funding from us. It was the Authority's decision that that was not one of the projects we wanted to look at now. A letter has been sent to Cynthia Barton of USGS explaining that at this time the Flood Authority will not pursue that project. A copy of the letter is in the member packets.

e) State Contingent Report

Mr. John Donahue stated on April 30 the Project Coordination Team convened for the Twin Cities Project. In attendance were Commissioners Averill and Willis and several Corps of Engineers staff and representatives from the State. One of the agenda items was the confirmation of the membership of a policy team intended to oversee some of the high level issues surrounding the Twin Cities Project. Membership includes both the Chair and Vice Chair of the Flood Authority and at the request of Chairman Averill we would like to add the cities of Centralia and Chehalis since they are impacted by the footprint of the project.

The Team will meet on an occasional basis rather than a consistent basis. Invitations will be sent out as needed, approximately every three months, but possibly more often as the agenda allows.

The Project Management Plan was in progress at that time and has now been completed and a draft is available.

A new schedule has been drafted which is part of the Management Plan. It shows the current effort, which is called Design Evaluation, is to be completed January, 2010 with public discussion on those results to take place two months following that. The next phase of work will be the design in earnest.

We talked about a public involvement event that would bring out some facts surrounding the Twin Cities Project process and it might be helpful to bring in other initiatives, including the Flood Authority and its efforts. This will be discussed later in today's agenda.

The meeting revolved around certain specific issues, five discipline areas that we brought back from a technical staff team meeting that took place last year. We were able to show what we had come up with and added hydraulic modeling, some technical issues and the desire of those present to bring out more information about certain decisions including implications regarding climate change, the use of LiDAR data, and documenting the project upstream and downstream. Details about operations and results of modifications to the Skookumchuck Dam were added as well. Information about flooding on

agricultural lands and concerns about erosion issues was shared. All this information will be added to the Project Management Plan and the staff will be convened to consider the final list, probably in June.

Occasionally the Project Coordination Team meets with the Communications Team and the Flood Authority is represented by Glen Connelly. We are working with that team to come up with more details about the public involvement plan.

The Team has been working with Lewis County to recover evidence of expenditure that contributes to the project prior to this. Shirley Kook has been helping with this. Her first examples of expenses incurred by the County have been sent to Mr. Donahue. This is very helpful as these expenses can be credited towards the Twin Cities Project.

Ms. Laura Orr reiterated Chairman Averill's mention of the meeting in Adna on June 5. Corps programs that may be of use in resolving the issues in Adna will be addressed. The Corps did go out in the field and there is a report available. There is a Section 205 which is a flood damage reduction project for smaller projects. If they choose to pursue this the Corps can help with that.

Currently we are continuing with the modeling for the Twin Cities Project. Pat Wheeler, a hydrologist with the Corp is in attendance today and will field any questions the Authority may have.

We are moving forward with a modeling tool for economics and with the wetland delineation where the proposed levees might impact wetlands and the mitigation that might be needed to compensate for that.

Next month, Ms. Orr will be introducing the new Project Manager, Bill Goss, and it is anticipated that the Project Management Plan will be completed at that time.

7. Ripe and Ready Studies Update

Mr. Dave Carlton gave an update on the status of the Ripe and Ready studies. A table was in the member packets. The PUD flood storage project is under way; the Skookumchuck Dam feasibility study is being worked on with John Donahue and Trans Alta. Some old plans were discovered and the 72" pipe is filled with concrete at least on one end. An interlocal agreement is being pursued with Puget Sound Energy for use of their generator, as well as a siphon option or other options for piping.

Mr. Carlton is expecting a scope of work regarding the early warning program. We would like to tie it into the work that Emergency Management Division is doing so there are no overlaps between their work and ours. The Authority is focusing on having all the jurisdictions work together on a system that works for all of them; there may be multiple systems but implementation is what we are really focused on.

Mr. Carlton spoke about the Lower Basin Hydraulic Model. He stated it is sometimes very difficult to talk to someone at FEMA and so far he has been unable to hold a

conversation with FEMA about their interest in developing the Lower Basin Hydraulic Model. They have expressed an interest in cooperating with that because they would like to update the flood maps for both Thurston and Grays Harbor Counties. We would like FEMA to help pay for it.

Mr. Carlton did not have an update on the seamless LiDAR.

The Decision Support Tool has a fairly well-defined scope of work and it is being negotiated between USGS, Corps of Engineers, the Basin Partnership and the Flood Authority.

The Analysis of Alternatives will come after the Tool, which will not be for another year. Once we have that tool, the Corps can utilize it in looking at alternatives throughout the Basin for both flood storage and summer low flow augmentation as part of the General Investigation.

It is hoped that The Partnership, the Corps and Flood Authority will work on a desired scope of work. The Corps needs a revised agreement management plan to be able to address flooding issues. We will also be working on an interlocal agreement between Grays Harbor County, Lewis County and the Corps.

Chairman Averill stated at last month's meeting the Authority looked at the projects we wanted to work on and these are reflected on the table in the packet. Because each one involves expenditure Lewis County will need a decision by the Authority when we come up with the terms of the agreement. It is Lewis County's agreement that we won't obligate the Authority until we have your agreement for it. To make it legal it must be passed by the Lewis County Board.

Your jurisdictions cannot be obligated by the Flood Authority unless you have sufficient time to take it back to your jurisdiction and discuss it. While there are two items on the agenda that are action items, there will be an opportunity for you to raise questions today to take back to your boards for approval in June.

8. Ecosystem Services

Mr. David Batker, Earth Economics, stated the best decisions are made with full information and that is why a study on Ecosystem Services is important. In the United Kingdom all flood projects have to be accompanied with a study by Ecosystems Services because it changes the dynamics of those projects. The Flood Authority would receive three things: 1 – it will help you identify flood protection projects; 2 – it will help prioritize those projects; and 3 – it will help you look at funding mechanisms.

Mr. Batker explained that Ecosystem Services are economic benefits that people receive directly from Ecosystems. There is flood protection, storm protection, recreation and salmon and fisheries, soil retention, climate stability and carbon sequestration, water supply and quality, water regulation, agriculture. There are 23 categories that we look at

for the study. This is important because the analysis prioritizes the projects, seeking out some funding for certain projects.

There was a large study done in Louisiana after Hurricane Katrina and that changed the USACE views, expenditures and approach in that state. Initially the Corps did not fully identify the significance of coastal restoration for storm protection.

Mr. Batker cited other projects and how they were prioritized for protection and other Ecosystem values. Complementing with the Corps of Engineers is very important for the communities in the Basin.

Ecosystems currently has a \$900,000 National Science Foundation grant for developing tools for Ecosystems Services for use in flood protection, water quality, etc. We want to partner with the Chehalis Basin.

Ecosystems would provide a report that shows dollar values of different Ecosystem services within the watershed; it will give us the ability to match other services and give us the opportunity to look at other creative funding mechanisms.

Chairman Averill stated the Authority is being asked to fund this project and its primary interest is flood mitigation. He is interested in hearing how the study can help in that process. There is already a project for looking at levees and another for feasibility for water retention. We are not against ecosystem protection but we are concerned about \$166 million in damages from one storm.

Mr. Batker stated we are economics. If you are looking at increased ponding verses levees and where the levees are located, every decision about where that levee is located has an impact on flood protection value as well as salmon and others. It is important to make those decisions with full information. If we had not done the analysis we did in Louisiana on the value of wetlands for providing direct hurricane protection Louisiana would have worse protection against hurricanes. We would like to have a conversation with the Corps on the hydrological study. Consider how many acre feet of water falls on timber, how much is soaked in and where you get the full flood protection. In the past we have had flood authorities who only concentrated on the mouths of the river. This Flood Authority is doing things the right way. You are looking at the whole watershed and that is crucial.

We want to map three things: the beneficiaries of flood protection; the provisioning of flood protection; and what we call the disturbance map: what are the elements within the watershed that are damaging natural systems or built structures from performing their useful task.

This is not a study on just how ecosystems will benefit; it is about the benefits directly to people.

Commissioner Willis stated Mr. Batker had mentioned several large projects and asked where the cutoff is when the project is no longer feasible. We have the dam project and the Twin Cities Project. When do these services not become useful to small projects?

Mr. Batker stated even if they were all constructed they would still be of some value because you can see the benefits of the services outside of Ecosystems Services. When we did our study in Louisiana, they were already constructing \$40 billion worth of levees. We understand you are not standing still; this needs to support your work and helps you where you want some prioritization and greater information.

Commissioner Willis asked if it would be better to bring back a host of projects including some small projects.

Mr. Batker stated it is far better to do it now so you have this information as you are designing and choosing the projects. If you have information that indicates retention of a wetland will provide "x" amount for fisheries, it gives you fuller information on making decisions on projects. Had we done the studies in Louisiana two years before Katrina, the taxpayers and the Corps would have saved a lot of money.

Mr. White asked when the Authority would see a deliverable.

Mr. Batker stated he would like to have eight to twelve months for a deliverable. What we did in Louisiana was release a report to the Corps every stage of the way. We would like to have useful information to you in four to five months.

Mr. Taylor asked if we could put the projects we have into the model would it show the benefits of those projects.

Mr. Batker stated we could do that. If you have the projects identified, we can identify the beneficiaries and evaluate the economic benefits. That would not be part of this scope. This scope is to give you baseline data of the suite of 23 ecosystem services within the watershed and help you prioritize.

Chairman Averill stated the Prosecutor's Office has not looked at this and that needs to be done. While the Chehalis Basin Partnership has begun a negotiation with Ecosystems they do not have funds to continue the project and have asked the Flood Authority to join with them so the project can go forward. They believe there will be a benefit for the Partnership and for the Flood Authority. At the point that you cause the Flood Authority to be the primary funding mechanism and the Partnership is not paying anything, Chairman Averill is not sure if the contract arrangement is one that we should create at this time. Having the Flood Authority pay to Grays Harbor to pay the contractor is not efficient. The Flood Authority should just pay the contractor directly. We will have a recommendation next month. Chairman Averill is not suggesting the Partnership be cut out; the Partnership needs this data as well as the Flood Authority.

Any questions on this issue should be brought to the attention of Bob Johnson or anyone on the Advisory Committee for consideration.

9. Expenditure Review

Mr. Bob Johnson stated the member packets had two papers concerning the Expenditure Review. One is from ESA Adolfson with their expenditures to date. The consulting services also include the Elway Research costs. The other paper is the expenditures for the period between 4.13.09 to 5.13.09. Total expenditure during that time was \$73,666.77 for a total to date of \$410,131.32 with the balance remaining at just over \$2 million.

10. Officer Elections

Chairman Averill stated an election was to be held in January and was not held and therefore would take place today. In the future, elections will be held every January as directed by the by-laws.

Mayor Schillinger nominated Commissioner Willis for Chairman; motion seconded. Mr. James Cook stated we are halfway through this year and believed things were moving along very well and nominated Commissioner Averill. Chad Taylor seconded. There were no other nominations and nominations were closed.

Chairman Averill stated there was testimony regarding open voting and the Board Advisory Committee had recommended the election be by secret ballot. The Chair spoke to the Prosecuting Attorney regarding this and asked Mr. Carter to recap their discussion.

Mr. Carter stated the County must comply with the open meetings act. With reference to this organization, it is a pure interlocal agreement. Each one of the members participates in this as a representative of his/her public entity and you are casting a vote as that public entity and performing a public act; therefore voting should not be done in secret.

A show of hands was (4) for Commissioner Willis and (4) for Commissioner Averill. Commissioner Averill had to break the tie and voted for himself. He stated there are two members missing and that in the past voting has been by consensus. He asked if the vote should stand or should the vote be taken when there is a full board. It was decided the vote should stand.

Nominations were taken for Vice Chair. Dolores Lee nominated Mark White; motion seconded by Commissioner Willis. Mark White nominated Commissioner Valenzuela; motion seconded by Mr. Schillinger. Jim Cook nominated Commissioner Willis; motion seconded by Commissioner Valenzuela. Voting was as follows: (3) for Mark White; (2) for Commissioner Valenzuela; (4) for Commissioner Willis. Without objection, Commissioner Willis will be Vice Chair.

11. Twin Cities Project Public Information Event

Mr. John Donahue stated when the Coordination Team met in April a proposal was presented that was formulated by the Communication Team regarding a public

involvement event that would provide for three purposes: create awareness about the process; demonstrate how agencies are acting in a coordinated manner; and to introduce the new project manager, Bill Goss.

It is our opinion that the community would benefit about finding out more about the project and how it relates to other initiatives, including initiatives of the Flood Authority and in particular a new initiative by the Corps of Engineers.

An open house will provide several displays: the different organizations participating; what is the process under which the Twin Cities project is understood to proceed; what is the schedule of this project.

This event is tentatively scheduled for September which will allow Mr. Goss to have some time to be brought up to speed and the project will still be in the evaluation stage. Mr. Donahue recommended two open houses; one in Lewis County and one in Grays Harbor County.

Chairman Averill asked if the open house would mean an event covering a few hours where people can come and go, and would the displays need to be manned by each organization.

Mr. Donahue stated that was correct.

Mr. Schillinger stated this is a great proposal and it is important to get information to the public.

Commissioner Willis volunteered to man the station for the Grays Harbor open house.

Commissioner Valenzuela volunteered to help and recommended an open house take place in Rochester. She stated we must be clear that the project is not a done deal nor is it just in the idea phase but somewhere in between.

Mr. Donahue asked if he should work on a possible third open house.

Commissioner Valenzuela thought an open house held in Rochester could be the Thurston/Lewis location.

Chairman Averill suggested a discussion involving Centralia and Chehalis and a decision could be reached at a later time.

Mr. Donahue and Ms. Orr stated they would plan on holding three meetings; Mr. Donahue would re-convene the Communication Team in early June and would work out more details and bring them back to the Flood Authority.

Ms. Hoffman noted the desire of the Flood Authority to participate in this and that it was appropriate to provide a station with information on what the Flood Authority is doing,

etc, and ESA Adolfson would work with the Corps on how to coordinate the work and the presentation of all the work.

Mr. Donahue suggested someone from ESA Adolfson attend the Communication Team meeting.

Ms. Hoffman stated depending on the decision of the Flood Authority regarding the ESA Adolfson contract amendment this would fall under the public involvement work task.

12. Public Workshops

Ms. Linda Hoffman stated there had been discussion in the past regarding more public meetings and these would occur when there is more information and draft recommendations to share. At this morning's work session it was decided that late summer or early fall would be the best time for these meetings. The draft Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan and draft recommendations would be the subject of the public meeting. The Open House scheduled with the Corps of Engineers will be another way to keep the public informed of the Flood Authority's work. With the Authority's permission, ESA Adolfson will continue with this plan.

Chairman Averill stated without objection Ms. Hoffman should proceed.

13. Recommended Actions

Presented at this morning's work session was an outline of the recommended actions that will be in the draft plan to be available in June. There are three categories: Major Regional Capital Projects, Local Capital Projects, and Nonstructural Programmatic Actions. We discussed criteria and considerations for evaluating projects and Authority members liked calling them factors for consideration rather than quantifiable criteria. We received feedback on the criteria themselves, a few additions and revisions, and in June you will receive a revised list of considerations.

Also discussed was the timeline and flowchart that was in the member packets. It describes what studies are under way to inform your decision making, what tools are being developed for your decision making, and a timeline was used to lay out when you will be ready for decision making on the various projects.

Local projects were discussed and which of those projects were ripe and ready or to consider for match money. There will be more work on those for prioritizing in June. The members asked for a prioritizing methodology using the factors for consideration.

Finally we talked about the list of programmatic actions, including an approach to consider regulatory programs and changes to those programs. There was a proposal in the packet regarding an approach to regulatory programs. The Authority members felt it was a good approach and wanted to involve community development staff for all jurisdictions in the work.

The Flood Authority members made the point in discussing the approach to regulatory programs that you might consider the product of that effort to be a set of best regulatory practices for flood plain and flood management protection and seek some consistency basin-wide and having recommendations from the perspective of the Flood Authority to the individual jurisdictions who would need to implement them.

With that direction, ESA Adolfson should be able to draft that section of the Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management plan and also initiate the work on regulatory practices and regulations.

14. Amendment of Agreement with OFM

Chairman Averill stated we received funding from the State to do our basin-wide studies through an interlocal between Lewis County and the Office of Financial Management. That agreement needs to be renewed.

Mr. Johnson stated the original OFM agreement had within it a budget for certain line items. In some of those areas we have money left and some are down to the last few hundred dollars. It is necessary to modify this agreement to reflect the appropriate person administering this in OFM, but also the original agreement only allowed for expenditures up to 10% over the budgeted amount. Because of the pattern of expenditure the new amendment better reflects anticipated expenditures over the next year.

Mr. Schillinger moved to approve amendment #1; seconded by Chad Taylor. Without objection the amendment passed.

Mr. Johnson noted an error on this document listing both Ron Averill and Lee Grose as Chairman; Ron Averill's name should be struck.

The Chair stated this would now go to the BOCC of Lewis County for approval for the Flood Authority.

15. ESA Adolfson Proposed Contract Amendment

Mr. Carlton stated ESA Adolfson has worked with the Board to prepare a scope of work for another year, July 1, 2009 through June 31, 2010 to continue facilitation and helping with the technical work. He outlined this scope of work and stated the proposed budget would be just under \$400,000.

Chairman Averill stated ESA Adolfson is still in the process of selecting another director for the project and suggested tabling the vote on this amendment until the June meeting. At that time hopefully there will be a new director. In the meantime, if anyone has questions about this amendment, please share that with us. Without objection, the subject was tabled.

16. Confirm Next Meeting and Board-Requested Topics

The next meeting is scheduled for June 18 at 1:30 with a work session scheduled for that morning. Chairman Averill stated most of the jurisdictions are very good about attending

the work sessions; however representation from all jurisdictions would be greatly appreciated.

Mr. Carlton stated the agenda states the BAC will meet May 22 and June 4. That is incorrect. The BAC will meet June 5 at 9:00 A.M.

Chairman Averill stated the BAC agenda needs to get out in a timely manner so anyone wishing to address an item on the agenda will have enough time to schedule that meeting.

17. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:17 P.M.