

**Flood Authority – Work Session
WSU Extension Conference Room
351 NW North St.
Chehalis, WA 98532**

**September 17, 2009 – 9:00 AM.
Meeting Notes**

1. Convene Work Session

Chairman Averill called the meeting to order at 9:16 AM.

2. Introductions

Self introductions were made by all attending.

3. Ecosystem Services

Mr. David Batker, Earth Economics, stated he would update the Flood Authority on his analysis study. The PowerPoint will be available to the Flood Authority if anyone would like to receive it.

The PowerPoint explained what provides flood protection benefits, what causes greater flooding, how the flow of the benefit of the flood protection moves and who the beneficiaries are of the protection.

Mr. Batker stated the reports on the Nisqually and Puget Sound regions are or soon will be available on Earth Economics' website.

Mr. Ken Bagstad explained the modeling.

Ms. Chris Hempleman, DOE, stated there are benefits of flooding. Mr. Batker stated flooding does have negative impacts but there are positive impacts of flooding for farming, etc. With the right activities in the flood buffer, there are a lot of benefits. Mr. Bagstad stated we will eventually have that data.

Commissioner Willis stated the generational benefits of flooding outweigh the negative. Her property has 18 feet of topsoil and that got there because of flooding.

Mr. Batker stated that over time there is no question that flooding is the source of agricultural fertility.

Discussion followed regarding marshes, drainage, water table, and conversions versus preservation.

A report will be provided at the next meeting with the results of Mr. Batker's study. The Flood Authority will make the most important basin decisions and you must think about the money spent on flood protection. We want to give you the most information to make the best decisions. Also, looking at funding mechanisms, modeling identifies

beneficiaries, causes, and where the flooding is taking place. That allows you to fund the proper flooding mechanisms. We need to think about creative funding mechanisms such as timber and carbon sequestrations and how we can fund flooding protection, water quality and salmon restoration.

Chairman Averill stated Earth Economics' cost benefit ratio is considerably different than the one used by USACE (Corps). You have been successful in Louisiana and those accomplishments have not made it across the Corps regions in other areas of the US. We have a big job of convincing the Corps. You need to talk to more than one office or person in the county regarding impacts of floods. From our perspective we have Community Development, Building and Public Works doing different things. Emergency Management works specifically with flood and flood aftermath. You will need contacts in Grays Harbor County and Thurston County.

Mr. Batker stated a roadblock with the Corps is the cost benefit analysis. The Seattle office wants to work with us and we are hoping for an okay from Dr. Moyer. We need to lay out all arguments and we will submit a grant.

4. Break

The group took a short recess and reconvened at 10:26AM.

5. Projects and Budget

Chairman Averill explained about the money spent, money allocated and money left in the Flood Authority's budget. Bruce and Bob will explain that we are some distance away from making a decision and going to the voters on a flood district. Chairman Averill anticipates that without a flood district the Flood Authority will still guide where we are going with flood mitigation. Our budget now with OFM runs through June 2010 and we need to talk to the governor's office about a supplemental budget in order to continue our progress and look at a flood district. That needs to be part of the discussion this morning. Currently the governor's budget is being worked on and we are approaching some decision gates. If we don't get something into the governor's office by the end of this month, it may not be considered by the governor. That also needs to be part of our discussion.

Mr. Bob Johnson stated he, Terry Willis, Lee Napier, Bruce Mackey and Shawn Murphy met last week regarding how the GI study is intended to work and what money is available and how we will move forward, particularly now that the Flood Authority is part of that process, even though the agreement was signed with the expectation that the Chehalis Partnership would be lead. From the Flood Authority's perspective, if we don't follow through on their study it won't get funded. At least some of our projects must be in the GI study to get funded. Also up for discussion is funding for the Flood Authority and an additional \$47.5 million and whether we can use that for the work the Flood Authority is doing. If we can, what happens if there is not enough match for the Twin Cities project? If we look at what is budgeted through June 2010 and the types of studies in place and consider the expenses, there is not a lot left over. There may be some deficiencies in citing contracts that are less than what was allocated. Another question:

part of the GI study includes looking at the local match and there is a local match from Grays Harbor. What kind of local match can we get out of these studies? If we are commissioning studies and the government says they are good studies but we won't be reimbursed, we have to come up with another \$250,000. We need to find out from the Corps if the Project Management Plan (PMP) which is in process in a draft form will give us credit for projects we have initiated. If we don't get credit for the early warning system project, for example, then we will have to come up with the \$250,000 local match.

Mr. Mackey stated there is a memo from the Board Advisory Committee regarding the local projects and budget. ESA and the Board tried to look at the 28 potential projects to see if they could be prioritized. We started with the three basic questions and we found it was difficult to come up with information that would answer those questions. They were not defined well enough. To answer those, we need projects close to shovel ready because then they can be compared. You got a list of projects which was a good idea. You need to keep that list but it is difficult to prioritize. Do you have the money to do it and if you do, how much money do you have?

Ms. Hempelman suggested looking at a supplemental budget, and that needs to be in Keith's office by October.

Mr. Mackey referred to the financial report dated 9.14. It shows a negative balance because the County included the \$35,000 for Elway and the Prosecuting Attorney expense in that column. Those should have gone in the next column for studies. The bottom number to look at is the \$135,347, the balance at the end of June.

You need to decide if you have any flexibility and how you want to use it. He referred to the Approved Studies and Projects Budget. You will probably want to do the first three. The Early Warning System will be talked about during the business meeting and the consultant who was awarded the bid will be giving you a staged budget.

Chairman Averill stated West Consultants, Inc. was chosen because they are doing the statewide project directed by the legislature. Because of that there might be some common data that will be beneficial to us.

Mr. Dave Carlton stated there will be some but from a basin-wide perspective how do you get jurisdictions integrated for effectiveness?

Commissioner Willis asked if this is a study or a project. Mr. Carlton stated we are thinking of having it phased: study and recommendations. That is where the budget problems will come into play.

Mr. Mackey stated there will be some flexibility: LiDAR negotiations are going on now and it may come in about \$20,000 less. Hydraulic Model funds may be available. You may want to be conservative and not make that decision.

Mr. Carlton explained how the LiDAR and hydraulic model tie in together. That model will be available in a year or two. Mr. Mackey asked if we do our own can we get a model any sooner? Mr. Carlton stated no because you need the LiDAR.

Mr. Johnson stated we talked about using real time. If that will produce that information we don't need to spend additional money for the same thing.

Mr. Carlton stated that is correct.

Mr. Mark Swartout asked if the onus to do the public outreach will be on the jurisdictions.

Mr. Carlton stated FEMA does scoping meetings and provides maps. We are trying to have meetings with the communities. A lot of the responsibility will be with the local communities.

Commissioner Willis stated we could take the \$300,000 off because we could use their product. Are they also doing the LiDAR? How can they do their portion?

Mr. Mackey stated they are waiting for our LiDAR base that will be used by several entities.

Mr. Mackey stated you need to look at Ecosystem Services contract to see if you want more money to expand that some more and work with the Corps to look at a broader perspective.

If you go back to the other budget documents and if you want to have money for consulting services, this budget does not have any of that here. You must be conservative with your project money to roll over for those other things or submit a supplemental budget to the governor for what you need next year, or you could do both.

Mr. Johnson asked if we would ask to tap into the \$47.5 million.

Chairman Averill stated that is possible. Until we make a decision on Twin Cities project the state is skeptical about obligating funds until they know something else is going to happen. We made it clear to the state that the basin wide study is very important as to where the Corps project fits in and that there are impacts upstream. We have been working toward the basin wide study and Twin City project in concert so we know all the benefits. The state will be reluctant unless we can show that it will contribute to the Twin City project.

The Chair went on to say that besides the \$47.5 million, we have accumulated some credit reserve such as local and state expenditures on Pacific International Engineers (PIE) studies. That is directed towards the Twin City project. There is some room as to what the local share might be (between \$3 and 6 million) and that is why Keith Phillips in the Governor's office is receptive.

Commissioner Willis was concerned about whether we are doing the bookkeeping right and if we are spending money at the appropriate time. Is it going into the Corps GI study in both fiscal and data? We want both things. We want this to go in as a match because that is what the legislature is expecting us to do.

Mr. Mackey stated you can use all studies and the Corps can use the data as long as it is compatible with their model. The question is when and how or if they can be used as a match. The answer from Bill Goss, USACE project manager, is: they do not count as a match until there is a signed signature from the state which is a year out. In that scenario, this would not be a match. However, he felt they could negotiate a Memorandum of Agreement between the Corps and the Flood Authority and say these studies will affect the County's match. We will need to pursue that.

Mr. Carlton stated we must have that agreement before the project can start. We need an agreement with the Corp on the scope of work prior to actually starting. Currently we are beyond that.

Mr. Mackey stated the Flood Authority made the decision that you need the studies and tools no matter what happens. The match has to be another question and you either missed it or you need another agreement.

Chairman Averill is concerned about the studies with the Corps. The ratio is 50/50. The \$574,000 the Corps was given would require a \$547,000 match. Whether we can use the partnership for that is a question. The Congressional House, in appropriations, is already looking at another \$500,000 match.

Mr. Johnson stated perhaps we should get a signed contract before we spend the \$250,000.

Mr. Mackey stated that would require a supplemental budget and another report.

Chairman Averill stated we need to make a decision about whether we want to direct staff towards a supplemental budget. Our contract runs out with ESA in June, 2010. Unless we can eliminate something, we need to come up with more money. The salaries and wages are legitimate expenses. The Counties are doing a lot of groundwork. We are looking at \$135,000 to operate past June 2010 if we don't make any other obligations. Then we are looking at a \$500,000 obligation for the GI study. These would require a supplemental to keep us in business.

Commissioner Valenzuela believes we should be more conservative and that we take action this afternoon for a supplemental request. It is fine for the governor's office to be receptive, it is another to act.

Mr. Mackey stated the Flood Authority could direct the BAC and ESA to develop a budget to cover the first three items on the budget. Should this be extended for a year?

The onus is on ESA for the scope of work and a proposal and at the October meeting you can decide if you will go with that. Mr. Mackey stated he will work with Keith on the supplemental budget.

Chairman Averill stated there is one problem: you have been given \$2.5 million and you only spent \$172,000. The reality is we have obligations.

Mr. Mackey stated the state understands that. Go back to the legislation that says you are to form a flood authority.

Chairman Averill stated Lewis County is working on the flood district boundaries now.

Mr. Mackey stated we will produce that chapter in the plan for January so you know alternatives and governance and finance.

Chairman Averill stated we will try to get the flood district on the 2010 ballot. Senator Swecker thinks he can get it through. We still need legislation regarding the commissioners for the district. The voting issue is now law: registered voters rather than land owners will determine the need for a flood district.

6. General Investigation

Ms. Lee Napier gave some background on the General Investigation. Grays Harbor County has been the local sponsor since 1999 so the Twin Cities project has a long history. There was an interest in the basin-wide issue. Ms. Napier provided a handout and explained the two GI studies: the Twin Cities and the basin-wide study. We are taking on ecosystem restoration and flood reduction. As we develop the PMP we are including those two components. The second page outlines why the PMP is important.

What are the next steps: complete the PMP. Who could help? Think about local partnerships. There is \$500,000 needed: how will you match that? What are you doing now and in the future to contribute to that? We need to recognize that everything we do is a critical component.

The only interlocal discussed is between Grays Harbor County and the Corps. We heard that the Flood Authority and the Partnership want to have a partnership. Are there others? The PUD is a possibility. An agreement is next.

Chairman Averill stated we agreed that we would take the original Partnership GI study and make it a joint study. In that regard, the PMP needs to show the mechanism that Lewis County used as lead for the Flood Authority. Lewis County cannot do anything unless it is brought to the Flood Authority and the Flood Authority agrees. The PMP should state that specifically. An interlocal makes that happen but the PMP should be specific that Grays Harbor County as the local sponsor must have Partnership and Flood Authority approval before Grays Harbor makes decisions.

We also need to take each study already identified and work it into the PMP so there is a basis to draw on as cost share. We cannot drag this out for seven years.

Mr. Johnson stated he and Ms. Napier have talked to the partnership and how the draft material gets adopted. This will not be a proactive process. They will draft it and we will be able to look at it. That presents problems. We need to discuss how it is written and how the process evolves. There was no input after it was written.

Chairman Averill stated that can be discussed. Ms. Napier stated we have to all be on the same page.

Commissioner Willis stated we have to get our projects into the PMP, too.

Mr. Glenn Carter asked if the PUD project fits into the description for purposes of the PMP.

Ms. Napier stated yes since it is a multi-purpose plan. The Corps will focus on projects they can take advantage of. We have a basin-wide issue and may look at another partner. There may not be a high number of projects because there are many components of one project. Think of how things fit together for an overall benefit.

Ms. Hempelman asked if it is predetermined how the money is apportioned between the two studies.

Ms. Napier stated she is not sure how that would work. We are trying to find things that fit the current PMP but provide a benefit for the overall purpose.

Ms. Napier asked how the Flood Authority would like to work this. Should she give a similar presentation to the partnership?

Commissioner Willis asked if the Flood Authority would give it to the technical committee. We want to get in on the writing of this.

Chairman Averill stated yes, and consultant also.

Mr. Tony Briggs, Trans Alta, asked if the county staff is looking for help from other entities. Ms. Napier stated she would be happy to have Trans Alta on board. Habitat projects would work in with this.

7. Adjourn

The business was complete and adjournment was at 11:46 AM.

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

**September 17, 2009
Meeting Notes**

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

Members Absent: Town of Bucoda; Mark White, Chehalis Tribe

Others Present: Please see sign in sheet

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from August 20, 2009
- Ripe and Ready Studies Report
- Memo from BAC re: Early Warning System program
- Expenditure Review
- Brochure from Twin Cities Project Open House
- Resolution re: West Consultants
- Amendment 1: OFM Interlocal Agreement
- WSDOT Freight News and Information e-mail
- Letter from USACE re: water retention

1. Call to Order

Chairman Averill called the meeting to order at 1:37 P.M.

2. Introductions

Self introductions were made by all attending.

3. Review and Approval of Agenda

Chairman Averill added "Supplemental Budget Request" after item 9. Without objection the agenda was approved with the addition.

4. Approval of Meeting Notes

Without objection the meeting notes from August 20 were approved.

5. Public Comment

Mr. Jay Gordon, Elma, spoke about the letter from the Army Corps of Engineers. There have been requests from flood victims for the consideration of dams. He asked why the study for water retention cannot be included in the current study. He was concerned that

I-5 will be raised only to discover in a few years that dams may have prevented that action.

Chairman Averill stated these issues would be discussed during today's meeting.

6. Reports

a. Chairman's Report

Some time ago the Flood Authority contracted with Earth Economics to study the basin to see what types of projects might work and what the economic impacts might be regarding cultural, commercial, social and environmental impacts. After Katrina devastated New Orleans, Earth Economics conducted a study to determine how better to protect the city. They worked with the Army Corps of Engineers to look at a fundamental change in the way the Corps looks at providing protection against flooding, which has traditionally been to build levees or to build them higher. Earth Economics successfully argued that the destruction of the Bayous over time essentially destroyed the natural capability of handling huge amounts of water.

Earth Economics is a Seattle company and Mr. Batker is from this area. Mr. Batker provided his first report at this morning's work session and it was very encouraging.

In August we talked about the Flood Authority's obligated funding. If everything goes as currently planned we will be pushing the \$2.5 million allocation by June of 2010. As a result we asked that our consultant and the Board look at where we are with budgeting. There may be some savings in certain contracts but until those contracts have been let we don't know what the real cost will be. We are working toward the establishment of a flood control district and until that flood control district is formed, the Flood Authority is the entity that moves towards mitigation. It may be necessary to request a supplemental from the Legislature in order to continue our work. Later in the meeting there will a motion to consider towards that end.

This morning we also talked about the General Investigation study. Congress provided \$574,000 to the Corps of Engineers to conduct a basin-wide study on flood mitigation for us. Insofar as the Corps already had a study ongoing, for both ecosystem restoration and flood mitigation, we agreed we would take the Basin Partnership's study in the interest of speeding up the implementation time and work with the Corps to put flood mitigation measures into that. The negotiations are still in process. We have had initial recommendations made to us to expand the Board Advisory Committee to include the PUD, Trans Alta and others to help us come up with a new project management plan. We will also be working on an interlocal between the Flood Authority, the Partnership and their two lead agents, Grays Harbor County and Lewis County, to formalize that.

The Flood Authority is very interested in incorporating studies already in progress or plan to put into progress because the Corps money has to be matched on a 50/50 basis and we would prefer to use in-kind costs rather than trying to find new money.

We will be talking about timelines and the Chair will discuss the letter from Congressman Baird later in the meeting.

There has not been a lot of discussion recently on the flood district for two reasons. First, we had hoped to get some legislation on the current flood district law. On one issue we were successful: the vote to form a flood district will be by registered voters rather than by land owners. A second bill before the legislature had to do with the number of commissioners for the flood district and how the citizens of three counties could be adequately represented by three commissioners. We asked that that number be expanded to five and the Chehalis Tribe asked to be included in that as well. If that happens, there will be six votes for the flood district. That bill went well through the Senate but was stalled in the House when the Quinault Tribe asked for the same representation as the Chehalis Tribe. Senator Swecker has been working on this issue and may have a solution which will be presented at the session in January. Until this issue is resolved, it did not seem prudent to move forward on putting a flood district on the ballot.

In the meantime, we need to determine the boundaries of the flood district. We have asked the county engineers to look at what the boundaries should be in each county. Lewis County has nearly finished its work and Thurston and Grays Harbor Counties want to see what Lewis County does before their engineers work on their respective boundaries. Hopefully by the first of next year the three counties can meet to finalize that point.

Regarding the letter from the trucking association, ESA Adolfson sent a letter to the trucking association suggesting a meeting in Vancouver as to what the Flood Authority is doing. There has been no response to that letter so far. The Washington Department of Transportation sent a similar letter to the trucking association offering to brief them on these issues as well.

The first open house on the Twin Cities project was Wednesday, September 16 at Swede Hall in Rochester. There was a very good turn out and there will be some discussion on that open house later in the meeting. Next week on the 23rd the open house will be in Montesano at City Hall and on the 30th it will be in Centralia at the middle school.

b. Member Reports

There were none.

c. Correspondence

A letter was received from Colonel Wright at the Corps of Engineers to Congressman Baird in response to the Congressman's letter. The Congressman asked that the Corps give consideration to water retention and other things that may be discovered during the basin-wide study and their impacts on the Twin Cities project for levees. The Corps' response cited Corps' regulations and law which restricts the Corps in their flexibility to make project changes. They suggest that the GI study will provide the information we are looking for and where that information can be incorporated they are willing to do so.

Chairman Averill would like to meet with the Colonel and Congressman Baird to discuss whether there can be more flexibility on this. The GI study is a 5-7 year process and we have been studying this for years and it should not take that long.

Commissioner Willis stated there had been a question posed to the Corps that if we do some of these projects, such as water retention, could that affect the design of their project. It raises the question: at what moment in time can we interject what we are planning to do and how will that affect how they change their design, etc? If we hold the water up somewhere it could change their design.

Chairman Averill stated that is our greatest concern.

d. Facilitator's Report

Mr. Mackey stated the first workshop for regulations from the various entities was held and the goal is to make sure that what everyone has is correct and also to look at alternatives and consistency. The next regulatory workshop is October 9 at the Lewis County Public Services Building, 2025 NE Kresky Avenue.

e. State Team Report

Mr. Donahue stated he appreciates the turnout for the open houses. Following the open houses, if there is enough for an agenda, the coordination team may be reconvened. He will be in contact with that group within the next week or two. Please contact Mr. Donahue with any comments.

A folio was produced in preparation for the open houses. Mr. Donahue distributed the literature which has information about the Twin Cities project, the basin-wide study and other programs.

Investigations continue in several discipline areas related to the Twin Cities project as part of the design evaluation period. We are concluding the field investigations related to economics and land values in both cities. Environmental and wetland investigations are also concluding. There were a number of site visits for potential levee locations. We encouraged the Corps to make contact with local officials regarding those site visits.

Mr. Bates referenced the project schedule and is concerned about the time frame involved. 2013 to begin construction is hard to accept when people experience flooding in their homes every year.

Chairman Averill stated that would be a good question to pose at one of the open houses. The Flood Authority has been talking to the Corps all along and those talks have not been successful.

f. Corps of Engineers Report

Mr. Goss was not available to give a report.

g. Lewis County PUD Report

Mr. Dave Muller stated he has a preliminary report from Shannon Wilson on the geotechnical work on the two dam sites. The field reconnaissance has been completed and the seismic survey shows bedrock outcrop at both sites as well as sedimentary rock with very little over burden which is good news. Both dam sites are very feasible for building. There are some challenges, primarily landslides that occur because of the terrain. Those are aspects that can be dealt with during design.

The next step for Shannon Wilson will be to further refine the geology and combine it with the geotechnical design work and ultimately conclude their report, which will be completed in about two months.

Mr. Muller gave some background on the fisheries and environmental aspect. During late July the PUD received reports that fish were dying in the Chehalis River. Biologists documented that very few fish were alive during the extremely hot weather. This is an example of what we will identify as to the water quality and water temperature and the information will be included in the scoping work. We hope this information, combined with existing data, will help better define the value of summer flow augmentation.

Fisheries will put information into the scoping document and public input is anticipated to complete the scoping document.

Commissioner Willis asked if documents could either be e-mailed at least 24 hours before the meeting or have paper copies available at the meeting.

Old Business

7. Ripe and Ready Studies Report

Mr. Mackey stated we are proceeding with Earth Economics regarding Ecosystem Services.

We are negotiating a contract on LiDAR and hope to have a contract soon. It appears it will be cost competitive.

The General Investigation report was given at the work session. The discussion included development of the project management plan and the resources that need to go into that. Ms. Napier summarized the update. She will be sure the handout from the work session is made available via e-mail.

Ms. Napier stated we need resources from the Flood Authority and from the Chehalis Basin Partnership and anywhere else that will clearly describe what the basin-wide project is: ecosystem restoration and flood damage reduction. We need to know what is being worked on so it can be included in the PMP and we can get match credit.

We need to establish relationships and formalize those into agreements. Once that is in place a feasibility cost-sharing agreement will be drafted. The BAC will be helping, as well as the counterpart from the Chehalis Basin Partnership, Trans Alta, and the PUD. If anyone else wants to participate please contact Ms. Napier.

Mr. Schillinger stated the City of Montesano is willing to participate.

8. Early Warning Program

Mr. Mackey wanted to discuss the LiDAR before getting into the early warning program discussion. We are ready to start a contract for seamless LiDAR which will be flown in the fall. He wanted to be very clear that he had the okay to do that.

Discussion followed. The Flood Authority will need to approve a resolution which will then go to Lewis County. That will be done at the October meeting.

Commissioner Willis questioned the process. She does not remember going through the process to contract with a company.

Mr. Mackey stated ESA looked at a lot of firms and went through a lot of negotiations.

Commissioner Willis stated there is usually a bid process and getting the Board's approval and there seems to be some steps missing.

Mr. Carlton stated originally we thought we would partner with Puget Sound LiDAR Consortium. During those negotiations we discovered FEMA has contracted with a department in the State of Oregon to fly the Washington and Oregon coastlines and also up the Chehalis River to the Wynoochee River. ESA believes this would be the best alternative.

Commissioner Willis stated we are spending public dollars and asked if this is the proper process to go about developing a contract; does it need to go out for bid and does it need approval by this board?

Chairman Averill stated it will definitely need to be approved by the Flood Authority board before Lewis County can act on it.

Mr. Carlton stated we may be able to do this with an interlocal agreement with the State of Oregon since it is another public agency.

Mr. Johnson agreed with Commissioner Willis and believes we should discuss this with the Prosecuting Attorney to see what bid laws there may be. As lead agency the County is required to comply with bid law when we let a contract.

Chairman Averill stated we do need to go through the process.

Mr. Mackey stated ESA will bring back a proposal for the Flood Authority's approval.

Mr. Mackey stated the Early Warning System program did go through the proper process. From four firms that submitted Request for Qualifications, West Consultants, Inc. is the firm that the BAC recommends. Once the Flood Authority approves that

recommendation, the scope of work will be completed and that will be brought to the Flood Authority.

Chairman Averill stated there is a resolution being distributed that will need to be adopted by the Lewis County BOCC in order to work out a contract with West Consultants. He entertained a motion to accept the resolution.

Mr. Schillinger made a motion to accept the resolution to contract with West Consultants. Ms. Lee seconded. The motion carried.

Chairman Averill stated that the Legislature passed a bill requiring the State to look at early warning systems statewide. The consultant hired by the legislatively established committee is West Consultants which will be a benefit to the Flood Authority.

An issue that might be considered is the use of sand bags for private use. Sandbags have always been available and used for public facilities and during the 2009 flood there were some available for private citizens which helped keep flood damage down. The Flood Authority may want to look into how this practice can continue without depleting the sandbags for public use.

New Business

9. Expenditure Report

Mr. Bob Johnson reviewed the financial report which was included in the member packets. Mr. Johnson noted that the studies include the PUD water retention project and Earth Economics.

Chairman Averill clarified the negative balance in the last column under consulting services. The Auditor inadvertently took the funds from the consulting fees rather than from the studies fees. That will be corrected.

9a. Supplemental Budget Proposal

Chairman Averill stated if we proceed with the items allowed for in the Encumbered Funds by June of 2010 we will be very low on funds. There is some concern that there will not be enough funding to continue, particularly considering whether there are obligations for a match on the GI study. In the 2010 appropriation Congress is currently considering additional monies between \$500,000 and \$1 million for the GI study, all of which require a match.

Before the Board is a resolution directing the BAC and ESA Adolfson to review the availability of funding necessary for the Flood Authority to work past June 2010. The BAC and ESA will report their findings to this Authority at its October meeting, including a request for additional funding in the governor's current supplemental budget.

The motion was made and seconded. There was no further discussion. Without objection the motion was adopted.

Mr. Schillinger stated the funding for the model development for the lower basin is included in the \$300,000. FEMA may be planning to undertake a model in the lower basin later this year and to be conservative with our expenses let FEMA fund that and save our money for other projects. Mr. Schillinger asked Mr. Carlton if there is something we should be doing to encourage that.

Mr. Carlton stated there will be scoping meetings in Grays Harbor and Thurston Counties but he is not sure exactly when. Invitations will go to each community and Mr. Carlton will make sure that both Ms. Napier and Mr. Swartout receive the invitation. The purpose of the scoping meeting is to collect information from the jurisdictions as to what the problems and needs are for flood mapping and provide FEMA with base mapping. After that meeting the consultants will put together a budget and take it to FEMA. Until that point, Mr. Carlton suggested leaving the money where it is.

We also need to encourage FEMA to talk to the Corps to find out exactly what they are doing in the lower Chehalis, what models the Corps is developing and if those can be used by FEMA.

10. Twin Cities Project Open House

Mr. Mackey stated the open house in Thurston County was very well attended. Information was available from Thurston County, USGS, National Weather Service, FEMA, the PUD, the Partnership and the Corps. Posters and handouts were available and all will be duplicated for the next meetings.

Mr. Schillinger asked how the open house was advertised.

Mr. Donahue stated he worked with Commissioner Valenzuela's staff and had a phone tree, a mailing list, and ads were placed in the Chronicle, Rochester Sun and the Olympian. A press release went out and flyers went out to several places, such as grocery stores, etc.

The next open house will be Wednesday, September 23 in Montesano at City Hall. The last one will be on Wednesday, September 30 at the Centralia Middle School. Both will be from 4 to 7 PM.

Chairman Averill suggested providing information on the Flood Control District at the next two open houses.

11. Confirm Next Meeting and Board Requested Topics

The next Flood Authority meeting will be on Thursday, October 15 at 1:30 at the Lewis County Courthouse. There will be no morning work session. Please submit agenda topics to Mr. Mackey.

Mr. Mackey stated this morning's work session was held at the WSU Extension conference room and everyone was very comfortable there. He asked for the Authority's opinion on holding work sessions there rather than at the Veteran's Museum.

Mr. Thompson liked that room very much and would like to have work sessions held there. Mr. Schillinger agreed.

Commissioner Willis stated she understood the room is used frequently and may be hard to book.

Mr. Mackey stated we will try to reserve that room and we will be very clear as to where the next work session will be held.

12. Adjourn

Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 2:47 P.M.