

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

**September 16, 2010  
Meeting Notes**

**Flood Authority Board Members present:** Glen Connelly, Chehalis Tribe; Dan Thompson, City of Oakville; Jim Cook, City of Aberdeen; Andrea Fowler, Town of Bucoda; Julie Powe, City of Chehalis; Edna Fund, City of Centralia; Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County Commissioner; Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County Commissioner; Ron Averill, Lewis County Commissioner.

**Board Members Absent:** Ron Schillinger, City of Montesano; Chip Elliott, Town of Pe Ell

**Others Present:** Please see sign in sheet

**Handouts/Materials Used:**

- Agenda
- PowerPoint and Flood Control Zone District Draft Legislation
- Public Involvement Draft Plan

Chairman Willis called the meeting to order at 9:06 A.M. and introductions were made. She recognized Mr. Hugh Spitzer.

**1. Draft State Legislation**

Mr. Spitzer stated that the legislation before the Flood Authority has to do with a multi-county flood control zone district and not the interim entity.

The PowerPoint explained the formation of a multi-county flood control zone district (FCZD) which includes boundaries. The formation includes agreement elements which had a checklist of agreements that must be approved. The elements include a treasurer, who must be a treasurer of a participating county. There must be a board of supervisors, the number of which is provided in the formation agreement. Mr. Spitzer stated you could choose to have elected officials as supervisors; the draft states the county commissioners may serve as supervisors.

Supervisors may be elected at large or from supervisor districts that have substantially equal number of voters. There was discussion regarding one person, one vote, cutting districts in two and following precinct lines. Because boundaries have to follow watersheds, the entire precinct should be included.

Mr. Swartout stated there may be a conflict if assessments are used. Some people may be outside the watershed. Could a rate boundary be different from a FCZD boundary? Mr. Spitzer stated if a FCZD includes precincts where benefits may not be the same, you may have a different assessment. You may also have to cross county boundaries for the election of supervisors.

It was recommended that an appointee from the state be taken off. Commissioner Valenzuela stated a Boundary Review Board has a person appointed by the governor but he or she is not an employee of the state. Mr. Spitzer stated this is a policy question and he was trying to build in a lot of flexibility. A decision needs to be made if the governor should appoint someone. If there is a deadlock to appoint,

the governor can intercede. Mr. Mackey stated originally it was considered to have someone like John Donahue and this is where the idea came from.

The administration of a FCZD is made up of a treasurer, engineer, advisory committee, and a budget.

The powers of a FCZD include all powers and immunities under RCW 86.15.080. There are overlapping districts within the FCZD and there is a tax cap and levy bumping. The FCZD is at the bottom. From a bumping issue, should the FCZD be treated like any other district? If it overlaps an existing FCZD there can never be more than a fifty cent property tax.

Ms. Bissonette stated when a district is formed the underlying zones could dissolve. A question was asked if the obligations could be part of the multi-county district and Mr. Spitzer stated yes. The obligations of the existing districts folded into the multi-county district go to the multi-county district.

Commissioner Averill asked if the taxes get collected by each county does the money get transferred and again Mr. Spitzer answered yes. If Lewis County does not have bumping problems but Grays Harbor County does, you might find yourselves inheriting other taxes.

An existing zone can convert into a multi-county zone and the legislative authority of a participating county may withdraw. Ms. Bissonette stated that if a multi-county zone did fee charges and sold revenue bonds and someone wanted to withdraw, they have to continue to pay until the bonds are paid off.

Chairman Willis referenced the legislation, the new Section 1, and thought the word "boards" should be more distinct. Mr. Spitzer stated it should read "legislative boards".

Commissioner Averill spoke to subsection C and stated there was no explanation on the number of supervisors. Mr. Spitzer stated the agreement must cover this topic. Commissioner Averill wanted to know the number of supervisors and how they are selected. Mr. Spitzer stated that was covered in subsection D. He suggested perhaps it should say how they are selected and if appointed, how.

Mr. Spitzer asked anyone to let him know if something in the legislation is not clear.

Commissioner Valenzuela spoke of an appointee by the governor. She stated it is still uncertain whether the tribes are involved and she thought the Board had agreed to include the tribes.

Mr. Spitzer stated the framework is in the statute and this body has made a decision that it is going to include the tribes but maybe Skagit County will want to create a zone and not have tribes. Should the state require a tribe's inclusion if a tribe is within a watershed? Also, a tribe may not want to be included.

Commissioner Valenzuela would like the legislation to read that the tribes must be included unless they choose not to be.

Commissioner Averill asked if a tribe chooses to join could they have a supervisor. Mr. Spitzer stated that may need to be explained to WSAC.

Ms. Bissonnette stated there is state interest in this legislation and one thing her group will ask is whether the Flood Authority will be able to share this draft form with others. The interest is coming from the Puget Sound Partnership: Whatcom, Pierce and King Counties. They are seeing the possibility of a multi-FCZD as a tool and they could support your legislation.

Mr. Mackey stated that is a good point. The last time you ran legislation you had people coming out at the end of the process and you are hitting on an important point. Run with it and find out who is supportive and who might have issues. Find a legislator who wants to run this as his or her bill. Once the decision is made there is a political strategy that says we have support and we want to get it through. There is political thinking that needs to happen here.

Mr. Ghilarducci stated Whatcom County has an existing district and if Skagit County wanted to form a multi-county district it would overlay both counties. Agreements with the counties must determine whose district takes precedence.

There was a discussion regarding the flood hazard mitigation plan. Mr. Swartout stated Thurston County must adopt the plan as it is, it cannot be an amendment. The CRS (Community Rating System) only wants to see one water plan for the County and an amendment will prevent any community from being rated more than a Class 5. If you form a multi-county district it will not be in the CRS program.

Mr. Easton stated we want the communities to adopt the basin-wide plan but the timeline is not conducive to getting it adopted. He asked if the counties need to adopt the basin wide plan before forming the district. Mr. Spitzer answered no.

Ms. Bissonnette asked about the individual districts being formed in another county as part of an interim agency. Mr. Spitzer stated he did not agree with that. The concept is the FCZD is in place within the watershed in each county and existing districts would have a cooperation agreement.

Mr. Bruce Treichler suggested getting language from the tribes that they would like to see in the legislation. Mr. Connelly stated the Chehalis Tribe has a copy of the legislation and will come back with comments.

Ms. Powe spoke about generating funds and asked what happens if a tribe wants to be a part of the FCZD but does not want to contribute. Mr. Spitzer stated when the voting system is created the tribes get to vote if they contribute funding; otherwise they are ex-officio members. He stated Section 1 tells you what has to be in the agreement. Language would exclude the Quinault because they are in a different watershed.

Commissioner Willis asked the Board about sharing this document with others who may have an interest. It was generally agreed that it should be shared.

Mr. Thompson asked when the legislation would be introduced and Mr. Spitzer stated this should be moved in the first month of the session during the budget session. It will be viewed as a "friendly bill".

Commissioner Willis would like it sent out to all tribes. Mr. Connelly stated there is a Washington state group of tribes.

## **2. Break**

The meeting recessed from 10:20 to 10:30.

## **3. Interim Flood Entity Governance**

Ms. Bissonnette recapped the last meeting where there was some agreement that there may be a small interim board, one person from each county, the Tribe and possibly the state and the decision-making structure would be similar to the Flood Authority's structure. Ms. Bissonnette had called some of the members since the last meeting and there seems to be two approaches to the interim governance structure. One is what came out of the last meeting: 5 members and try for consensus. The other point of view was to try to make the transition between the interim board and the final one as transparent and easy as possible. Think about the end game with multi-county legislation and try to get to that with the interim board. At this point FCS could facilitate which objectives you want to achieve. The decision on an interim structure does not have to be decided until next year.

Ms. Bissonnette asked if there were thoughts on these two options or if there is a third. What about the cities? In the interim structure we must rely on existing state law because we don't know what is going to happen. Cities are currently excluded because of the existing statute.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked if the cities could be included as voting partners. Mr. Spitzer stated yes. Mr. Ghilarducci stated the initial recommendation is that they would be members of a strong advisory board but not on the board of supervisors.

Mr. Spitzer stated the interim entity is comprised of the FCZD in each county and that is created under the district FCZD statute. Under the Interlocal Cooperation Act and the new legislation being worked on for joint utility entities, they could include cities if the cities have a storm water utility. If you want an entity that includes cities, you could because you have one right now under the Flood Authority.

Ms. Bissonnette stated she would be asking these questions to all the members she has not spoken to yet. She also stated that Mr. Donahue did get permission to say yes if the state is to have an appointee to the supervisory board.

Commissioner Valenzuela would like to keep it as it is now and not exclude anyone from conversation or further steps. If we have the option of including the cities, keep it open.

Mr. Jason Humphrey stated an 11-member board is cumbersome. He suggested deciding how to represent everyone and break it down to the counties, state and tribe. The Tribe represents a small number of people. Keep it proportionate to population.

Ms. Bissonnette stated the new board will become effective on July 1, 2011. She agreed that a smaller board is better and population and area is important in making it representative of the population and getting the board down to five or six members.

Commissioner Averill agreed that the interim board should not be so large that it is unmanageable. If this legislation passes in the current session we would be in line to form the final organization by the end of 2011 or early 2012. It might be best to have an interim organization similar to the final one so the transition would be seamless. Commissioner Averill thinks the county commissioners are too busy to do the job of running the district. Currently the legislation has the county commissioners doing it. If we go to an election by district will we get the representation that is the concern of the cities?

Mr. Spitzer stated the people would have a say in who gets elected.

There was considerable discussion on deciding the size of the board, whether it should include county commissioners and others, if it should be based on geographic location or population. Mr. Spitzer stated these are policy decisions that need to be made.

Mr. Connelly stated the Tribe wants a seat on any board that will have action on the reservation. If there is not a representative with some connection to the reservation, the Tribe won't support it because it does not allow some other body to be over a sovereign nation.

Chairman Willis went around the table and asked the board members for comments.

Ms. Powe stated there was talk about tiered rates. If there are less people in one zone then representation should not come from other areas.

Commissioner Valenzuela disagreed that 11 members is too large. She disagreed that the county commissioners are too busy to be members. She understands that the interim body does not need to be very different from the Flood Authority.

Ms. Fund stated the interim board needs to be close to what the legislation asks us to do so we won't have to make big changes to the final board.

Commissioner Averill stated the current legislation makes the county commissioners the supervisors. He has tried in the past to get nine commissioners together and that has proved to be very difficult. He has no problem with a county commissioner being on the board, however he does not believe the board should be made up of all county commissioners.

Chairman Willis stated a lot of these struggles will be answered as we go through legislation. Mr. Spitzer stated the legislation will give you tools; it will not solve the problems but it tells you that you can do it any way you want.

#### **4. Wrap-up and Materials Distribution**

Ms. Bissonnette stated the Board appears to be okay with the flexible legislation. Ultimately the Board will negotiate elected or appointed supervisors and the interim body should be on the way to the ultimate body.

Ms. Bissonnette distributed public outreach comments and they can be used to set up the October meetings which will be on the 14<sup>th</sup> at Swede Hall in Rochester, the 18<sup>th</sup> at Montesano City Hall, and on the 27<sup>th</sup> at Centralia Middle School.

Ms. Bissonnette stated that Mr. Donahue did not get a chance to say anything on behalf of the state. Mr. Donahue stated that the state was mentioned in the formation of the district and WSDOT is interested in participating at some level.

Commissioner Willis stated the interaction could be as a supervisor or at the interim board. Mr. Donahue acknowledged that those are other options.

Ms. Powe asked if there is a map that has a breakdown of the Chehalis Basin by population. Chairman Willis thought the auditor might have such a map.

#### **5. Adjourn**

There was no other business before the Board and the meeting adjourned at 11:33 A.M.

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

**September 16, 2010  
Meeting Notes**

**Board Members Present:** Glen Connelly, Chehalis Tribe; Ron Averill, Lewis County Commissioner; Julie Balmelli-Powe, City of Chehalis; Dan Thompson, City of Oakville; Edna Fund, City of Centralia; Andrea Fowler, Town of Bucoda; Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County Commissioner; Jim Cook, City of Aberdeen; Dolores Lee, Town of Pe Ell; Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County

**Board Members Absent:** Ron Schillinger, City of Montesano

**Others Present:** Please see sign in sheet

**Handouts/Materials Used:**

- Agenda
- Meeting notes from Special Meeting and Business Meeting, August 19, 2010
- Ongoing Efforts
- Financial Reports

**1. Call to Order**

Chairman Willis called the meeting to order at 1:33 P.M.

**2. Introductions**

Self-introductions were made by all attending.

**3. Approval of the Agenda**

Chairman Willis noted that approval of the meeting notes would include both the special meeting and the business meeting of August 19, 2010. There were no other changes and the agenda was approved.

**4. Approval of meeting notes from August 19, 2010**

The Chair asked for approval of the special meeting notes.

Ms. Fund stated Julie Balmelli-Powe's name was omitted and should be added. The notes were approved with the correction.

The Chair asked for approval of the business meeting notes.

Commissioner Averill stated he had no corrections but wanted it noted that he and Ms. Anderson might have taken some liberties with an interpretation of a statement by Bill Goss. His literal statement was not clear and Commissioner Averill wrote it as he understood it. The interpretation was sent to Mr. Goss but he did not respond.

Ms. Anderson stated Mr. Goss did respond to her and the interpretation was acceptable to him.

There were no other corrections and the minutes were approved as written.

## **5. Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

## **6. Reports**

### **a. Chair's Report**

Chairman Willis stated there was a very active discussion at the morning session regarding the flood district formation. There will be public meetings on the flood district formation on October 14 at Swede Hall in Rochester, October 18 at the Montesano City Hall and October 27 at the Centralia Middle School. This is the first time the Flood Authority with FCS Group will meet with the public to introduce the flood district formation.

There were two documents given to the Flood Authority for its review and to give comments. They will eventually go to the newspapers with an informational packet but they are now in draft form awaiting corrections.

### **b. Member Reports**

Commissioner Averill stated the Northwest Steelhead and Salmon Conservation Society made a presentation to Oakville on Monday and will do the same in Bucoda on Tuesday. They have been sharing correspondence with County Commissioners. Chairman Willis stated she would share those with the rest of the Board upon request.

Ms. Powe asked that any correspondence between the facilitator and/or consultants and the Commissioners be shared with all the members. It is difficult to respond to the public if the board members are not informed. Most recently it was regarding Anchor QEA's role.

Chairman Willis stated she would try to be more sensitive to that.

Ms. Fund stated Lewis County Extreme Build constructed a home from the beginning to the end in eight days. The original house was flooded in 2007 and the owner has continued making her mortgage payments even though the house was condemned. She was one of 15 people who applied to have a house built and hers was completed this past Sunday. It was all volunteer labor and about 146 entities donated to the building of the house. Ms. Fund stated it was very uplifting for the neighborhood.

### **c. Correspondence**

Chairman Willis stated she had received some correspondence and it would be covered in the agenda items.

### **d. State Team Report**

Mr. Donahue stated he had nothing to report.

### **e. Corps of Engineers Report**

Ms. Andrea Takash stated the Corps was asked at the last Flood Authority meeting to send a formal letter explaining that water retention cannot be added to the Twin Cities Project. The letter has been written and is just waiting for signature and should be sent out early next week.

On September 15 the interagency working group doing the environmental mitigation assessment met to discuss their report. That report will be available soon.



There are public meetings starting next week. They will start at 5:00 with an open house; at 6:30 there will be a formal presentation followed by a question and answer session. September 23 is the first meeting at the Centralia Middle School; September 29 will be at Swede Hall in Rochester and September 30 will be at Montesano City Hall.

Ms. Takash reported that the repairs to the existing levees in Lewis County are being finished. The Salzer Creek rehab work has begun and completion is expected October 8.

Chairman Willis asked if the formal letter is being sent to everyone on the Flood Authority. Ms. Takash stated the intent was to send it just to Chairman Willis and to Bruce Mackey. She stated she could send it to Ms. Anderson for distribution to everyone.

Chairman Willis stated she would work with Mr. Mackey when they receive the letter.

Commissioner Averill stated that the Skookumchuck levee is not being done at this time but the city has resolved the tree issue and should be able to get that project into next year's window.

Ms. Fund asked Ms. Takash if the Corps and EES are working together to complete the data for Phase IIB. Ms. Takash stated she is not aware of formal meetings and stated she would look into it.

#### f. Lewis County PUD Report

Mr. Dave Muller stated EES continues its work on Phase IIB, which is the engineering and economics for the water retention facilities in the upper basin. They are using the HAZUS model that was developed by FEMA and Mr. Muller understands it was being used by the Corps of Engineers. They are incorporating the Corps' methodology for how they do the benefit cost into the analysis. They have updated their cost estimates for the engineering and are plugging that into the benefit cost analysis and they have begun work on a report for internal use. They believe they will be prepared to give a presentation on Phase IIB at the November Flood Authority meeting if that fits with the Authority's schedule.

Mr. Muller responded to Ms. Fund's question. He stated early on when Phase IIB was started the Corps indicated that they could not spend a lot of time on the coordination of PUD's economic analysis because they did not have funding until the GI PMP was signed. Mr. Goss indicated he could answer simple questions. It was Mr. Muller's understanding that EES has renewed the request that the Corps sit down with EES and go over how they have gone about their analysis; whether it makes sense how it's been done, etc.

Chairman Willis stated one piece of correspondence she received was between Mr. Muller and Anne Falcon of EES. Copies are available if anyone would like to see it.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **7. Ongoing Efforts Update**

Mr. Mackey referenced the Ongoing Update in the packets and stated items were removed that were not currently active or were not budgeted for.

The General Investigation is on the agenda and will be discussed later.

The Flood Plan has been approved by the Flood Authority and it has been sent to the jurisdictions recommending adoption.

The Flood District Formation will be discussed later in the agenda.

Mr. Mackey asked for an update on the early warning progress and received an e-mail from Mr. Dave Curtis which Mr. Mackey read. In summary it stated field equipment has been ordered; gauges have arrived; sensors are scheduled to arrive in early October. They are coordinating with the National Weather Service for prioritization of gauge site installations; development work on the internet interface to display maps is ongoing; hydraulic models have been obtained and the creation of inundation maps has begun; various alternatives are being investigated for mobile warning signs.

Commissioner Averill stated Lewis County owes West Consultants an agreement with USGS to cover those gauges. Details are being worked out and a resolution has been passed to do that.

Commissioner Averill continued to say that the early warning computer system being devised by West is for the Chehalis Basin only. It has caused some consternation with Lewis County's emergency management people who deal with two other basins. The concern is that while the Chehalis Basin reporting will be improved, oftentimes during storm events they have to look at the Cowlitz and Chehalis Basin and this would be an uneven type of reporting. Commissioner Averill pointed out to them that this is a pilot model and that once it is done in this basin, because West has the statewide contract for early warning, we might see some spin-off to bring other basins into similar types of systems. While it is a good system and we will do our best to work it into our [Lewis County] situation, both Grays Harbor County and Thurston County may have similar problems with their emergency management people.

Mr. Mackey stated the web display is built to incorporate various kinds of data and West will be incorporating some but there are obviously things that can be added to it. As soon as they see how well it works for the Chehalis Basin, National Weather Service or other NOAA data is available for other places that could be integrated.

Mr. Jerry Louthain stated he is working with West on this project as the local interface. West has had a contract to do a state-wide flood warning system. Currently we are contracted only for Phase I and that work has been completed. There is no on-going contract for a state-wide flood warning system. That was done with Washington State Emergency Management Division and he has talked with them and will be talking with them further. The next step is to go to the legislature for additional funding for implementation.

Chairman Willis asked if there was an issue with what the Flood Authority is doing not coordinating with the state-wide system; that they could mesh together at some time. Mr. Louthain stated it could be expanded to a state-wide system but right now the scope is for the Chehalis Basin only.

Chairman Willis asked what Phase I entailed. Mr. Louthain stated it is primarily an inventory of what is going on state-wide for individual counties, what the existing flood warning systems are, and information has been received from Snohomish and King Counties that is more sophisticated. There is no funding on a state-wide basis.

Mr. Mackey continued with the Ongoing Efforts Update, which was the Fish Study. Mr. Mackey contacted Mr. Paul Schlenger last week and received an e-mail from him and will send it to the members as soon as he can.

Several issues were addressed. Regarding site access, conversations are continuing with the three upper watershed land owners, which are Weyerhaeuser, Sierra Pacific and Vince Panesko. Weyerhaeuser and Sierra Pacific will require agreements with Lewis County on behalf of the Flood Authority rather than Anchor and will contract with Lewis County. The same agreement has been required of Lewis County PUD for previous studies and they are working with Mr. Johnson and Mr. Carter to draft that.

Discussions with Weyerhaeuser have been productive; they have not restricted the team's ability to work as planned. Field work has been done from Pe Ell downstream and has been sufficient for providing the data needed so far. Anchor has provided Weyerhaeuser biologists with additional information and a longer-term site access agreement is hoped to be secured. An interim access agreement with Weyerhaeuser is also desired.

Discussions with Sierra Pacific have also been productive. Anchor is in the process of getting more information and when Sierra Pacific gets the information they need, Anchor anticipates work on the access agreement to continue.

Field study crews have been working on the river throughout last month. In August the team worked on identifying locations for good river access, locations for water temperature modeling, and to familiarize the team with the ecological setting. A crew is walking or boating the river for accessible portions of the river from the proposed dam sites in the upper watershed down to Porter. The mapping work includes mapping habitat sites, side channels, eroding banks and large woody debris.

In terms of agency coordination for the PHABSIM analysis, Anchor is working with Thomas Paine on behalf of Anchor and representatives from WDFW and DOE have been contacted to solicit input on the study design.

Based on WDFW and DOE feedback, the fish study will not need to collect additional data on Weyerhaeuser and upstream of Pe Ell. The 2004 study by the two agencies provides sufficient information for that portion of the reach; study efforts will be focused on lower portions of the reach between Pe Ell and Elk Creek.

Ms. Powe asked if there will be increased costs by working with another company. Mr. Mackey answered no. This access was part of the contract with Anchor. Mr. Spencer stated it is also for a fish study as opposed to a geologic study and a different level of permit is needed and would have been needed by anyone going into this study.

Chairman Willis stated there was a fish study sub-committee meeting scheduled for Friday at 1:30 at the Timberland Library service center in Lacey and it has been canceled as there is no need for that meeting.

Mr. Mackey stated the peer review has been completed and is available on the Flood Authority's website. A letter from OFM was sent on August 31.

## **8. Flood District Formation Update**

Chairman Willis reported on the morning meeting on the flood district formation. The consultants walked the Board through the timeframes and the issues that will come up and decisions that need to be made in order for a flood district to be formed. Public meetings are needed to explain to the public what this action might look like. There have been a series of meetings and discussions with all the county commissioners as well as talking with city councils, other members, and the Tribes.

There is draft legislation that the Flood Authority looked at this morning and the consultants took some corrections or changes in language that the Authority thought could be improved upon. This legislation will not just affect the Flood Authority but will be approved to use statewide and has a bigger significance than just with the multi-county flood district formation. In that regard, we will be doing in advance, extensive outreach with other entities that might be affected by this legislation so that we will know what their issues might be and collect partners who might want to weigh in on this. It is the hope that approval will come more quickly with a larger voice to the legislation.

The Chair asked for additional comments from the Board. There were none.

## **9. General Investigation**

Ms. Lee Napier began by recapping the Project Management Plan (PMP) and the General Investigation Study.

The General Investigation (GI) study is a basin-wide investigation by the Corps of Engineers and Grays Harbor County is the local sponsor. A GI needs a PMP. The GI study has been ongoing since early in 2000 and as projects progressed, the plan became outdated. More recently, we have been working with a group comprised of members from the Chehalis Basin Partnership and the Flood Authority to update the PMP. We expected the PMP to be approved in April to move into a feasibility cost-sharing agreement.

When Ms. Napier released the current version of the PMP, objections were raised related to one of the steps that happens during the feasibility study, which is called the Project Conditions Report. In the PMP the Project Conditions Report included describing the levee project as if it had been built. It has not been built and people had concerns about describing the conditions to include a project that may or may not be built. Based on that information, review of the PMP was placed on hold. The group expressed concerns to the Corps that they wanted the Corps to consider a conditions report that included the levees and did not include the levees. The Corps brought back a proposal and there was a joint meeting with the Chehalis Basin Partnership and the Flood Authority where the situation was discussed. The Corps presented what it would look like to have a feasibility study that included those conditions. The outcome was the Corps would look at the possibilities of removing water retention from the basin-wide study and, instead, put it in the Twin Cities Project plan. The basin-wide general investigation study has two purposes: ecosystem restoration and flood damage reduction. The Corps investigated if they could remove water retention and flood damage reduction from the basin-wide study to include it in the Twin Cities Projects. The Corps might have thought they could do that because of the reformulation plan.

At the August meeting, the Corps announced that this was not possible. If water retention was to be studied, it would have to be part of the GI. As the local sponsor, Grays Harbor thought it would approach the Chehalis Basin Partnership, which deals with the ecosystem side, and come to the Flood

Authority, who deals with the flood reduction side, and ask what is next. We did not hear from this group in August and the Chehalis Basin Partnership discussion is scheduled for next week.

During that time there have been some changes made in Grays Harbor County. A department head resigned and Ms. Napier was appointed as the interim Planning Director. That presents some transitional issues for the work she used to do as Deputy Director of Community Development.

The discussion of the GI is changing yet again. Ms. Napier has spoken with her Commissioners to determine how she can continue to do what she used to do and is expected to do now. There will also be transitional issues with the work Ms. Napier did with the Chehalis Basin Partnership.

Ms. Napier asked for questions.

Mr. Cook thought the PMP had to be in place prior to any work being considered for grants, etc.

Ms. Napier stated he was correct. The PMP begins to describe what might be credited. The feasibility cost-sharing agreement needs to be in place before "in-kind" credit can be secured.

Chairman Willis stated the last version was a draft version and comments were requested. Several members put time into making corrections to the draft. The Corps took those corrections back and the Corps sent back a copy with the corrections they made and those that they did not make. The version dated May 28 is now the latest version.

Ms. Napier stated that is correct and she asked the Corps to modify the April version where the objections were made to include a cover that reads the date in May. It is still the same version but the April version did not distinguish it from other versions.

Commissioner Averill asked if that version included the chart that was provided on the timelines.

Ms. Napier stated it included the timelines for feasibility project conditions, including the levee. It did not include anything brought forth or discussed at the May meeting.

Commissioner Averill stated in July the Corps provided a timeline chart showing how both the GI study and the Corps Twin Cities project would line up. That chart shows that if we go forward with the GI study we will be able to look at where water retention would fit, hopefully having enough information to make a decision around 2016 when construction would begin.

Ms. Napier stated that is not included in this version of the PMP, but it is a tool that would be helpful.

Chairman Willis stated there has been a conversation with Sean Murphy from Patty Murray's office regarding the fact that the PMP has not been signed. There are funds allocated to the Corps to keep its work going but it has been made perfectly clear that we come to an agreement on the PMP. It adds weight to the Flood Authority's decisions and gives the state something to work with so it can keep funding the Corps activities here. This is a half million dollar congressional appropriation to have the Corps keep working on this particular GI. By the Flood Authority making a commitment to what is going on it allows the state to fund that commitment.

Ms. Powe stated a lot of hours went into the PMP and she didn't believe anyone had an objection to the work that was done. The issues were when the Corps came back and the time and money had risen, and the fact that the without project conditions were not included also caused the PMP to stall. The Chair asked the Board how it wanted to move forward. The project is before you, you know what the circumstances are and we know what the history is for the past few weeks.

Commissioner Averill stated we need to get out of the stall. There are questions still out there and the process we previously used with work sessions with members of the Partnership and Flood Authority is a good first step to take. The ability of the Corps to participate in working with us on other projects is tied to the PMP. We need to schedule another session and hopefully people who were working on this project before will come to the table so we don't have to bring new people up to speed. We need to state what the objections are, what we can do to resolve those so we can get to the next step of making the decision whether we move forward with the GI study or not.

Chairman Willis stated we also need to determine which objections we cannot resolve and we need to know how to handle those.

Chairman Willis stated the Chehalis Basin Partnership had a concern about ecosystem restoration and the Flood Authority was concerned about flood retention. She asked if it would be advantageous to get together with both groups or would it be better to stay separated to work on each issue. Her reasoning was to keep the expertise on each subject and come together at the end to review all the information. Can we actually get the Partnership and Flood Authority together to work on this and do both parties have the time to get together and work on it.

Ms. Napier asked for clarification. She heard "work group" and the full bodies.

Commissioner Averill believed there were work groups that included both entities. Ms. Napier stated that was correct. Commissioner Averill thought that would be the place to start. Once the work groups look at it and try to resolve things, they will still need to go back to both bodies.

Commissioner Averill and Ms. Napier stated most of the meetings were held in Thurston County wherever a large meeting room could be secured.

Mr. Mackey stated the sub committee's work was to follow through and put together the projects to make sure we met all of the Corps' process. The two major issues are whether or not you want to do both without conditions in the PMP; that decision has not been made. And as it currently stands, Grays Harbor County is the sponsor and there was some concern about that relationship and the relationship to the other counties. Those are not issues that a working group can solve. They need to be addressed by the Flood Authority.

Mr. Mackey stated it was suggested that perhaps the state could step in for that role. Mr. Mackey asked that question to Mr. Phillips and he said the state is interested in being helpful to meet a basin-wide agenda. That has been their stance all along given the legislation as well as the funding. Mr. Phillips did say if they did so now it would be part of the governor's budget proposal because the \$50 million went back and if you want it you need to go back to the legislature for it. Before it could be part of the governor's proposal they would wait to see what the report from the benefit cost analysis is from the Corps on the Twin Cities project, as well as the report from the EEC in October or November about that

benefit cost analysis. Mr. Phillips stated he is willing to come to the Flood Authority and discuss this issue.

Commissioner Averill poses two issues to resolve. One is establishing ground zero of where we are going with the study, and also sitting down with Mr. Phillips. He believes that would be two separate meetings.

Chairman Willis stated she agreed because Mr. Phillips has already stated he needs more information and he wants to wait until those reports come out. In the meantime, we need to get the work group back together again to take whatever issues are left and hammer those out so the Partnership and the Flood Authority can come to an agreement of what the PMP needs to look like.

Mr. Mackey did not believe there were any major issues with the PMP. The major issues are policy issues and the working group could work with the Corps to re-write it to include both without conditions, including the Twin Cities and not including it if that is what the Flood Authority wants. As it is right now, it includes the assumption that the Twin Cities project will be built. If you make that decision, the work group can make that a reality. It is laid out pretty clearly in the PMP that the local sponsor is Grays Harbor County.

Commissioner Averill stated the reason he asked about the chart is because it indicated we might get something out of the GI study to help us make a decision. But since it is not part of the current PMP we need to talk about how we might accomplish that with the Corps.

Mr. Mackey stated that would mean going back to the Corps and stating we sign the PMP and you [the Corps] undertake the work including not only the two proposed dams but other structural or non-structural flood mitigation options, and what can you tell us at the feasibility stage about those options and their feasibility. Would that be enough information for the Flood Authority to make some decisions prior to making decisions about construction on the Twin Cities project. We could work with the Corps to clarify that.

Ms. Powe asked if November's report would have an answer from EES whether water retention is feasible from a cost standpoint. Mr. Mackey stated from what has been reported they are working with the Corps standards to develop a benefit cost analysis. Using those standards and that analysis, including the updated engineer costs, the report would be available in October and would be presented to the Flood Authority in November.

Chairman Willis asked if those are the same reports that the governor's office is expecting to see.

Mr. Mackey stated the governor's office wants to see that one because it tells them what is happening with the benefit cost analysis on the proposed dams, and they want to know at the 35% design the benefit cost analysis on the Twin Cities project. They will then have more information on the feasibility of both of those projects.

Ms. Napier stated the Flood Authority has expressed concerns that are policy level decisions but the Partnership has also expressed concerns about whether this should or should not be a two-purpose project. We worked together, but the Partnership works with low flow issues and the Flood Authority deals with high flow issues. They are questioning what their role is in having a two-purpose study. That

is a consideration that they need to factor in as well. They did not have the chance to talk about it last month but they will talk about it next Friday.

Chairman Willis asked if there could be a workshop with the combined groups. She asked who set the meetings up the last time and how it was done.

Ms. Napier stated all the groups worked together to set them up. She confirmed that there would be a policy level discussion about the conditions reports, whether the Partnership is agreeable to having flood risk reduction included, and sponsorship. Chairman Willis stated that was correct, as well as discussing a workshop meeting.

Mr. Muller thought one of the big issues was the \$24 million and a 14-year schedule. He understood that was a lot of the objection that had been raised.

Commissioner Averill stated that is why he wanted to concentrate on the chart. We might get to the six-year mark and decide it is not worth it.

Chairman Willis stated that is what the chart indicated to us. There was a decision-making spot down the road where the tougher decisions could be made; it was a good place to stop and take a look from a financial standpoint. That's why Commissioner Averill wants the chart to be there.

Chairman Willis asked for confirmation about who is coordinating the workshop meeting.

Ms. Napier stated representatives of the agencies will work together: the Partnership, the Flood Authority, Grays Harbor County and the Corp.

Mr. David Plotz recommended instead of going back and forth between committees and the Flood Authority, could a decision be made today that as it relates to sponsorship we think "x" and as it relates to with and without project conditions, we think "y". That way the joint meeting could be more focused on delivering the results the Flood Authority is looking for.

Chairman Willis asked if the Board was ready to make those types of decisions without having a workshop.

Ms. Napier asked the Board to remember that the Partnership would be doing a similar effort, so it could be done independently or try to do it together. She understands about having some direction, but the Partnership is still going to have that discussion and it will not have the benefit of hearing the Flood Authority's discussion.

Ms. Napier stated there is an expectation at the joint meeting that there will be representatives of the Flood Authority there, and representatives of the Partnership. While it is a workshop, we expect the policy level individuals will be there. We will discuss whether it will be a multi-purpose study. With respect to the without projects conditions report, the last we heard was we wanted to see it further explored to have two without project conditions reports describing the levee and excluding the levee. The final point would be local sponsorship.



Chairman Willis asked if the Board should take a straw poll on these three topics that would move forward to the workshop as a suggestion at that workshop that there is weight to these issues one way or another. Does the Flood Authority feel it has enough information to make decisions on this?

Several members indicated no, they did not have enough information.

Mr. Cook stated there is not enough information to make a hard decision, but a tentative decision to give some direction as to which way to go would be helpful.

Commissioner Averill stated he has an idea of where this should go but he has an issue with holding a work session to discuss something that is based on preconceived notions which are not negotiable. It should be an open discussion.

Chairman Willis suggested the work group not go forward with preconceived notions, that these will be the topics that are discussed at a workshop. This is going to be helpful to go back through these with both groups because quite a bit of time has gone by. She asked if this was agreeable and no one disagreed.

Chairman Willis stated Grays Harbor County has moved Ms. Napier into the position of interim director of the Planning Department. Grays Harbor County is happy to have her in that position and it raises some questions. She has been very instrumental in the Chehalis Basin Partnership and the Flood Authority activities and she is not going to be able to be spread too much thinner. She asked Ms. Napier how that might play out in the near future.

Ms. Napier stated a similar discussion will take place with the Partnership next week. Her duties may be contingent upon how much time she may or may not be able to spend on other projects. The meeting next week may answer some questions here. In particular, who will the local sponsor be? If the sponsor should change that would change Ms. Napier's role. She offered a word of advice to anyone who might want to be the local sponsor: it requires a considerable amount of time and dedication. A half-time person might be a consideration.

Mr. Glen Connelly congratulated Ms. Napier and stated her energy and skills would be missed, especially at the Chehalis Basin Partnership.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **10. Expenditure Review**

Commissioner Averill stated he would summarize the expenditure review since Mr. Johnson was out of town. The budgeted amount is \$3,500,000 and we have expended between August and September \$115,407.13 which is explained on the attached page. The total expended to date is \$1,317,805.12, leaving a balance of \$2,182,194.88 with additional encumbered funds of \$879,200.91. The balance accounting for those encumbered funds is \$1,302,993.97.

Mr. Mackey stated that the \$900,000 approved for the fish study is not included in that figure, which will greatly reduce it. On the details, under Studies, part of the ESA Adolphson facilitating is in that section as well and he is not sure if it is reflected in the balance. The balance considering those expenses is probably closer to \$400,000.

Chairman Willis stated Mr. Johnson had received a letter from the FCS Group regarding their budget and progress reports. They have expended 16.2% to date. They had a contract ceiling of \$499,000 and the budget remaining is \$418,557.

#### **11. Confirm Next Meeting and Board-Requested Topics**

The next meeting will be on October 21, 1:30 to 3:00 at the Lewis County Courthouse. A special meeting on the flood district formation will be that same day at 9:30 a.m. at the Veteran's Museum. The Chair asked if there are specific topics that the members would like to add to the business agenda.

Ms. Powe asked if there was going to be a response or action on the Flood Awareness Week that will be held in Thurston County in October.

Mr. Swartout stated there is a statewide Flood Awareness Month in October but Thurston County is doing a week long flood awareness program. The Thurston County Board will adopt a resolution declaring it as a Flood Awareness Week. There will be a couple of workshops to bring flood awareness to everyone in the community.

Mr. Swartout suggested at an earlier meeting that perhaps sometime in the future we could coordinate throughout the whole Basin so we could all have a flood awareness week at the same time.

Chairman Willis suggested that at least the Flood Authority makes a declaration of a flood awareness month that can be put into the meeting notes and put out to the community through the website. We like to support those types of events because it is through talking with our communities that we had less devastation in the last major flood. Some sort of declaration should go on the next agenda.

#### **12. Adjourn**

There was no other business before the Flood Authority and the meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.