

**Background Information
Flood Authority Meeting
July 19, 2012**

This document contains some of the background information of the July 19th meeting of the Flood Authority. It includes:

- I. Work tasks approved and funded by the Office of Financial Management.
- II. Staff roles
- III. Proposed amendment to consensus decision process
- IV. Staff recommendation for next steps for Jobs Now Act projects

I. Work Tasks July 2012 – June 2013

- 1. Hydraulic Modeling: Utilize updated hydraulic model to examine potential projects or flood relief scenarios; continue to work in coordination with other modeling work in the Basin to minimize duplication and ensure efficient use of resources.
- 2. Early Warning System: Finish installing and calibrating final two gages of early warning system, and update inundation maps using recently completed hydraulic model.
- 3. Downstream bridges and structures: Evaluate potential flood relief alternatives for bridges and roadways, including potential bypass structures , culverts and flood relief mechanisms at areas that currently create flooding issues.
- 4. OFM/Alternative Measures Report: Continue to work closely with OFM to review and respond to alternative flood mitigation report required by ESB 2020 (the capital budget language).
- 5. Jobs Now Act: Work with OFM and the Chehalis Tribe to implement flood relief projects identified in ESB 5127, the Jobs Now Act of 2012.
- 6. 2013-2015 Capital Budget: Work to identify potential capital budget projects for 2013-2015 capital budget, and identify next steps for the Flood Authority.
- 7. Develop recommendations for on-going organization structures and work to reduce flood impacts.
- 8. Support public outreach.

II. Staff Roles

- Jim Kramer, Facilitator – Lead point of contact for decisions needed by the Flood Authority and decision-making process, work with Chair and Vice-Chair to facilitate Executive Committee and Flood Authority meetings. Responsible for overall staffing interface with Flood Authority including Executive Committee. Lead for internal and external relations/communications in support of Chair, Vice-Chair and other Flood Authority members.
- Scott Boettcher, Lead Staff – Responsible for routine administrative tasks and logistical support to Flood Authority and its subcommittees. Responsible for work plan development and tracking. Researching and developing staff recommendations for issues that will come before the Authority and subcommittees. Supported by Greg Hueckel.
- Nancy, Administrative Support – Responsible for scheduling and coordination support. Tracking contract status and expenditures using Lewis County monthly reports.

Near Term Staff Tasks

1. Jobs Now Act projects: Support Authority decisions to advance projects
2. Flood Warning System: Gage installation and funding for on-going maintenance and operation. (Scott)
3. Finalize Anchor QEA on Fisheries Enhancement piece (Scott)
4. Outreach (Jim and Scott)
 - a. Chehalis Tribe
 - b. Quinault Indian Nation
 - c. Governor's Office
 - d. Legislative and Congressional Staff
5. Information gathering/processing (Scott/Nancy)
6. Update Project List (Scott)
7. Support flood awareness efforts by three counties (Scott)

III. Proposed Amendment to Consensus Decision-making Process

As adopted by the Flood Authority, decisions shall be made by verbal, informal consensus of those Flood Authority members who are present. The Flood Authority in January 2012 reaffirmed its operating rules to make decisions by consensus. Staff recommends an amendment to how consensus decisions are made by the Authority. Included below is background on why groups use consensus, a definition and the process recommended by staff to make consensus decisions.

Consensus-Why Use It? (From The Policy Consensus Institute-Practical Guide to Consensus)

- An issue is not getting addressed; the costs of indecision/uncertainty are mounting for everyone
- Decision makers in other forums may not address the real issues
- An agency could make an unpopular decision and no one would follow it
- The parties may need each other's continued cooperation
- Consensus agreements can result in better solutions
- Consensus processes can shorten the lists of disagreements or clarify issues for decision makers
- Consensus processes can enhance the sense of fairness/equity in decision making processes

Consensus-Definition

One definition used by groups like the Ruckelshaus Center:

The group will reach full or partial consensus when each member can say:

1. I believe that others understand my point of view
2. I believe I understand others' point of view
3. Whether or not I prefer this decision, I support it because it was arrived at openly and fairly and is the best solution for us at this time

Consensus-Process

Recommended Process for Consensus Decisions by the Flood Authority

Chair/Facilitator introduces the issue and highlights the question/s for discussion and decision by the Flood Authority.

All members give a chance to express their perspective, ask questions and clarify concerns and suggest ways to address the issue.

When it is clear to Chair/facilitator that all members have had an opportunity to talk, facilitator will summarize the discussion and articulate a potential decision for the consideration of the members. The members will provide an initial indication of their support using the protocol below.

Thumbs Up -Good to go-full consensus

Thumb sideways - Partial consensus-can live with the decision for the good of the group/process

Thumb down -Not in consensus

If any members indicate partial consensus by showing a thumb sideways, the Chair/facilitator will ask the reasons for the partial consensus to ensure the member/s are supportive of the decision or if there any changes would increase the support of the member/s.

If any members indicate they are not in consensus by showing a thumb down, than the Chair/facilitator will ask the member/members to describe their concerns and if there are any changes to the action that could gain their support. The Authority members will then discuss potential changes to action and see if a consensus is created amongst all members. If there is no consensus after the continued discussion then the issue will not advance or the members can call for a vote consistent with the operating rules.

IV. Staff Recommendation for Next Steps for Jobs Now Act Projects

TO: Chehalis Basin River Flood Authority (Flood Authority)
FROM: Scott Boettcher, Staff to Flood Authority
SUBJECT: Staff Recommendation – Next Steps on ESB 5127 Jobs Now Act (section 313) funding

This memorandum provides suggested next steps on ESB 5127 funding for the Flood Authority's discussion and consideration at the next (7/19/2012) Flood Authority meeting.

A. Background:

Flood Authority has approved funding to date as follows:

- Category A: *"Repairing and Modifying Levees and Dikes (including but not limited to, the airport levee, levees protecting the Adna and Bucoda areas)."* [**\$1,483,974 out of \$1,875,000; Unspent = \$391,026**]
- Category B: *"Modification of the Sickman Ford Bridge, and Floodplain Culverts (to open up the channel, increase conveyance, and allow for flood relief)."* [**\$0.00 out of \$2,075,000; Unspent = \$2,075,000**]
- Category C: *"Installation and Calibration of a Rain Gauge on the Chehalis Reservation."* [**\$50,000 out of \$50,000; Unspent = \$0.00**]:
- Category D: *"Construction of Evacuation Routes and Pads (to avoid future livestock losses)."* [**\$500,000 out of \$500,000; Unspent = \$0.00**]:
- Category E: *"Improvements to Areas Affected by the Satsop River."* [**\$0.00 out of \$500,000; Unspent = \$500,000**]:

See background document entitled "V2.3 Background Doc -- 07182012 -- Chehalis flood fund projects."

B. Staff Recommendation on Next Steps for Funding:

Unspent Category A Levee funding [\$391,026] –One option for the unexpended funds is to fund project design work that would lead to more precise cost projections for the 2013-15 Capital Budget. At present it is an open question as to whether or not "design only" is consistent with legislative intent. OFM is planning to meet with legislative staff and provide an answer within a few days. In the meanwhile, two scenarios emerge that the Flood Authority could consider. These are provided below. Design needs are documented as follows:

Projects where design can be completed in time (by 11/01/2012) for consideration in the 2013-15 Capital Budget	
Bucoda Levee (Design)	\$ 42,000
Total -->	\$ 42,000

Projects where design may not be completed in time (by 11/01/2012) for consideration in the 2013-15 Capital Budget	
Wishkah Road (Kersh) (Preliminary Design)	\$ 100,000.00
Wishkah Road (Kersh) (Final Design and PS&E)	\$ 200,000.00
Trail/Dike behind Burger King (Design)	\$ 24,600
Dike bank of Wishkah north of Hwy (Design)	\$ 47,000
Market Street Dike (Design)	\$ 113,000
Southside Dike / Levee certification (GeoTech/Structural)	\$ 50,000
Total -->	\$ 534,600.00

- **Scenario 1 -- If Design Only is Fundable** – Part I -- Move forward with approving design funding for the Bucoda project (\$42,000) on the basis that: design work can be completed in time (by 11/01/2012) for consideration in the 2013-15 Capital Budget; flood hazard reduction benefits accrue for essential town infrastructure (wellhead); the project was specifically named in the 5127 legislation for funding; and 1.0 “jobs FTE” is supported.

Part II – Work with project leads for remaining design projects to further flesh out project details especially as relate to flood hazard reduction benefits and project impacts/effects.

- **Scenario 2 -- If Design is Not Fundable** -- Work with OFM to explore “reappropriation” of remaining funds to next year.

Category B funding [\$2,075,000] -- The Chehalis Tribe is conducting additional analysis and design for the Sickman Ford project as well updating an inventory of culverts. The work will be completed in the next couple of months. Once the work is complete, the cost, benefits and effects of the Sickman Ford project will be more precise. There is no action to be taken by the Flood Authority at this time.

Category E funding [\$500,000] -- Project design options need to be updated to incorporate current conditions of the Satsop River. Project proponent (Grays Harbor County) has identified a need for (a) new design work on the project using current LIDAR information and (b) an RFQ process (conducted by Grays Harbor County) to identify alternative restoration concepts and designs. New design work is anticipated to cost \$130,000. It is uncertain if the new design work can be completed in time (by 11/01/2012) for consideration in the 2013-15 Capital budget. Staff recommendation is as follows:

1. Clarify with OFM if design only work is consistent with legislative intent.
2. Work with Grays Harbor County to further flesh out project details, including flood hazard reduction benefits and project impacts/effects.

3. Report back with recommendation at next Flood Authority meeting.