

Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority **Work Session and Business Meeting – 9:00 a.m.**

Bucoda Community Hall
202 S. Main Street, Bucoda

August 16, 2012 - Meeting Notes

Board Members Present: Dolores Lee, Town of Pe Ell; Edna Fund, City of Centralia; Ken Estes, City of Montesano; Ron Averill, Lewis County Commissioner; Dan Thompson, City of Oakville; Vickie Raines, City of Cosmopolis; Alan Vanell, Town of Bucoda; Karen Valenzuela, Thurston County Commissioner; Bob Nacht, City of Chehalis; Frank Gordon, City of Aberdeen; Terry Willis, Grays Harbor Commissioner

Board Members Absent: Lionel Pinn, City of Napavine

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Comments on Draft Chehalis Basin Alternatives Report
- Jobs Now Staff Report
- Background Document
- Meeting Notes from July 17 Morning and Business Meetings; July 26 Telephone Meeting

1. Call to Order and Welcome

Chairman Raines called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. She thanked Mayor Carr and the Town of Bucoda for hosting the meeting.

Mr. Kramer stated a different approach was used for this meeting. There was only one agenda with the second meeting would start at the end of the first meeting. He thought it would allow some flexibility in running the meeting.

2. Introductions

Self-introductions were made by all attending.

3. Chehalis Alternatives Report Discussion

Mr. Kramer stated he had sent out comments on the Alternatives Report to the Flood Authority; DOE comments were sent out separately. He had read through the comments and there were a variety of opinions for flood mitigation including a water retention dam, dredging the river, and bypasses. There were not many comments about a levee system. Mr. Kramer asked for comments from the members.

Commissioner Averill thought DOE's comments should get more attention. There were implications that wording was inaccurate or something was covered that should not have been covered.

Ms. Fund was pleased that the comment period was extended from August 10 to August 31. She asked if the DOE comments would be addressed.

Mr. Estes asked if the people doing the modeling had contacted DOE to discuss this or was DOE ignored.

Ms. Hempleman stated that DOE technical people worked on it. There has not been a lot of discussion about the Clean Water Act and the fish study did not go into it much. The use of the river as designated in the WAC may change if the retention goes forward. DOE has never had to do that before and it is currently being discussed.

Mr. Kramer did not think DOE had been ignored, but that people were unaware of the work that had been done between DOE and Watershed Science and Engineering in preparation of the draft report. Mr. Kersh stated he is still concerned about water in the lower basin. He does not think there has been enough emphasis put on the tidal waters in the basin.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated the report made statements about a 2' benefit if there was a dam without reference to all the hydrology models showing that. Those are the types of comments she would compile when she reads the DOE report. There has not been enough conversation about how different storms affect flooding. She stated she was pleased with the thorough DOE review and the extension of the comment period.

Mr. Kramer stated Larry Karpack had sent an email in response to the DOE issues. Some were raised prior to the report and discussed with Mr. Karpack and there are differences of opinion about comments made by DOE regarding hydrology. Mr. Kramer stated it would be helpful if Mr. Karpack's commentary to these comments were distributed so they could be taken into consideration. Authority members agreed and Mr. Kramer will contact Mr. Karpack and get that process going next week.

Mr. Kramer asked the members what their process was for reviewing the report, if any issues stick out in particular, and if the Flood Authority Board should comment as a group.

Chairman Raines stated she has not reviewed the report but her staff is looking at concerns for Cosmopolis. She did not think the Flood Authority should comment but rather each representative on the Flood Authority should report what his or her jurisdiction's comments are. The report is a tool for the Flood Authority, and she noted that the Flood Authority did not comment on WSE's or Anchor's report.

Mr. Thompson thought the report was put together well. Oakville thinks water retention has to be part of the solution and it will comment. He thought the Flood Authority should comment.

Commissioner Averill stated if the Flood Authority were to comment it would be a mixed bag because of the differences of opinion. That is the role of the ad hoc committee tasked by the Governor: what is their recommendation for endorsement? Even in the upper basin there are different impacts on each of us and while we are fairly clearly in support of water retention as being a project that will do the most good regarding flood mitigation, there is still a difficult issue as to how to mitigate damage to the environment. He stated the Lewis County BOCC would most likely comment.

Mr. Estes stated there are two issues in Montesano. One is the sewage treatment plant. If it is breached there will be an ecological disaster. There is also a place where the river would knock out a business. If the river goes through the ox bow it will change the flow of the river which will impact the state highway. In 2010 the Montesano City Council passed a resolution in favor of water retention. The council will be asked to make a formal comment on the report. He believes the Flood Authority should comment.

Ms. Fund stated Centralia also signed a resolution in favor of water retention. The Centralia City Council meets next week and has not addressed the report yet. Regarding the Flood Authority commenting: if each jurisdiction puts in its comments, that states their positions. The Flood Authority comment may be thanking people for commenting and that we are looking forward to moving forward. She asked if the Flood Authority's comment needs to be by consensus.

Ms. Lee did not think the Flood Authority should comment because of the diverse opinions. Pe Ell Council will most likely comment when the report is addressed at the next meeting.

Commissioner Willis has reviewed some of the document. She will give it to the county engineer to review and he will be informed as the Authority moves into projects. A citizens committee has been formed and they were asked to review the report and will most likely comment. Commissioner Willis thought the jurisdictions on the Flood Authority should comment and that the Flood Authority as a group should comment, especially about decision-making or whether anything is missing from the report.

Mr. Gordon stated the water retention benefit in Montesano will be negligible. The biggest problem Montesano sees is there is nothing on environmental costs. The dam will affect 70% of the salmon habitat and that will create massive court fights with the Tribes. The cost of taking care of major damage has not been included in the report. His council meets Wednesday and he will recommend that the council not vote until it sees the numbers on the environmental issue. The Flood Authority should have separate comments.

Mr. Nacht stated Chehalis is on the record of being in favor of water retention. Mr. MacReynold is on vacation and when he returns he and Mr. Nacht will discuss whether or not the city will officially respond. It most likely will. Individual comments are on the record as to what the concerns are; Flood Authority consensus would be difficult.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated Thurston County is in the process of compiling comments on the report. In general, it is a well-written report and Thurston County shares some issues with DOE. She does not think the Flood Authority should comment as a whole.

Mr. Vanell agreed that the Flood Authority jurisdictions should comment individually. He will be reading the report and commenting, but he will advise the Bucoda Town Council about the report.

Mr. Kramer asked if the Board should comment and if it did what would its comment be.

Mr. Thompson thought the Authority should comment but it would not carry any more weight than any other jurisdiction. It could take some of the main points: mitigation, water retention, I-5, and state something we can all agree on positively about each one.

Chairman Raines stated there would be a slew of assumptions upon which people could not agree. Each jurisdiction owns that input and the Board might not want to go along with other jurisdictions. The Board's goal is to take the comments and implement the report; she did not think a consensus would be reached from the Board.

Ms. Lee stated if the Board was going to comment it should be a general comment that is reached by consensus: that we are still fact-finding or looking at costs and for more information.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated the Flood Authority is not in charge of this report. One comment the Board could agree to make: We agree that the legislative intent was met by this report. Or, on page 9, there are bullet points that are hallmarks of basin-wide solutions. We did talk about each of our ideas about basin-wide solutions. She did not hear agreement to the bullets listed. If we could come to agreement on those, that could be a second comment. While we are fact-finding we would continue to look at basin-wide solutions.

Mr. Kramer stated the bullets came from summarizing the comments everyone made, but there was not agreement. He will look at the wording – he did not intend to imply that those were things that were agreed upon.

Commissioner Willis thought the Board should comment that it reviewed the report and that there are things in it that the Board should comment on, such as what is missing. What Commissioner Valenzuela implied is critical. There were some projects that showed up on the list that she is not sure went through the Project Committee. The community is going to want to know where the Flood Authority is on this and they might think that the Flood Authority wrote it, not OFM.

Mr. Estes stated the executive summary does not mention the Flood Authority by name. There is no ownership and he agrees that the Authority should say that it has read and approved the report. We can say that each job has been approved and agreed upon and that the Authority came up with decisions that will affect the entire basin.

Mr. Thompson read from the report, page 9. It states that the Ruckelshaus Center will continue working with the leaders in the Basin to develop a recommended set of priority projects to reduce flood damage. The Governor's office will consider public comments, the final report and recommendations from the Basin leaders to make recommendations for priority flood mitigation projects. Mr. Thompson stated this is what we are talking about – the Flood Authority should comment.

Chairman Raines stated the ad hoc committee will make recommendations.

Commissioner Willis stated the ad hoc committee is made up of people not on the Flood Authority so the Flood Authority should comment. Chairman Raines stated the committee would make recommendations that it refers to the group.

Commissioner Averill stated the Ruckelshaus Report is a result of legislators stipulating a number of different approaches. There were some things already in progress by the Flood Authority and others. One is that WSDOT is going to suggest protecting the freeway and airport levee area. One project was the US Army Corps of Engineers project that is not going anywhere. The Ruckelshaus Report is not a solution but is to provide to the legislature comments on a number of solutions that the legislature wanted to hear about. There is no single thing we can comment on as a body. We are not ready to pick out a single measure. As a body we can endorse the thoroughness of the study even though there are still questions to be answered.

Mr. Kramer stated each member was in the process of determining what their jurisdiction would do in regard to the report; some have analyzed the report, some know what each jurisdiction's view is. He thought it would be very difficult to make a comment from the Flood Authority on the substance of the report and the direction forward. A discussion could take place once each jurisdiction has commented

and those comments are shared. At the September meeting the Board could discuss what the Board thinks, answer some questions that were brought up, and decide which basin-wide solutions make sense. The discussion will be focused after having the benefit of all the comments. The Chair can draft a brief letter representing the perspective that this report is a tool used in decision making and that it is premature to make a decision as the Authority. The plan is to discuss comments at the September meeting. He asked for thumbs on the letter. There was approval.

4. Jobs Now Projects

Mr. Boettcher explained the layout of the staff report. Part I shows how the Flood Authority has obligated about \$1.5 million and it now needs to determine how to disperse the remaining money. Part II lays out sequencing for evaluating projects. The table looks at features associated with the projects, and Part III provides options as to how to proceed with funding the projects. Categories A, C and D in Part I have already been funded or are partially funded, and none of Categories B and E have been funded.

Mr. Butch Ogden stated there is NRCS funding for escape routes on two other farms. The Conservation Commission has advanced \$12,000 for engineering and permitting.

Commissioner Willis stated her recollection of signing the agreement was that \$500,000 would go to the Commission to distribute. Grays Harbor County was not notified of these funds and she was concerned that Grays Harbor farmers were not asked the same questions. It appears that the money went to Lewis County without looking further.

Mr. Kramer asked Commissioner Willis if she was asking for a change in how it had been proposed. Commissioner Willis stated not to the Tribe, but to the State Conservation Commission because they will be obligating the money to the communities. She was disappointed that the Commission did not take the step to notify the districts in all three counties, and that the cost to other counties might have been less than it was in Lewis County.

Mr. Ogden stated he did contact Thurston County and there was no knowledge of any interest. He brought it up with the Grays Harbor Commission and asked Jay Gordon about losses during the flood. Criteria used at the Commission level animal losses. The Commission itself has not approved of the distribution of these funds and will not until OFM gives it the money. The list of projects that the Commission has is in Lewis County. The cost estimated for Lewis County is \$875,000 and the Commission is trying to find ways to make up the balance.

Commissioner Averill stated it is not just for critter pads where that is true. There is \$4.5 million needed for levee projects in the lower basin alone and critter pads must be looked at the same way. Additional projects must be documented because of the need to go to the 2012-2013 Legislature. The Commission does need to go to Grays Harbor and Thurston Counties – there could be a project to move up in priority or to consider for future implementation.

Commissioner Willis stated Grays Harbor County did have some cattle losses as well as some near misses. If the water had stayed longer there was a chance for a 200-head loss. Some of those things were not reported. There is a perception in Grays Harbor County that all of the mitigation activities are happening in Lewis County. We do not want to give that appearance. The answer might come back the same, but you have to ask the question.

Mr. Ogden stated the list of projects approved by the Flood Authority is at the Tribe. The Conservation Commission will come up with a list as to what else is out there.

Mr. Boettcher stated there is \$349,000 left in the levee category. The list of projects exceeds that amount of money. Part II of the staff report provides the stages needed to complete a project. The Flood Authority needs to figure out where the projects are in terms of readiness. Table 1 shows the name of the project, whether or not it has gone through the analysis process, preliminary costs, final design and permitting timeline, final cost, and number of jobs created.

Page 6 shows funding themes. \$495,000 is needed to fund the next stage but there is only \$390,000 left. Some suggestions for budgeting this money: 1) Fund all projects at a reduced level and move them all forward; 2) Only fund those projects with known costs in that stage; 3) Fund strategically to make it into the capital budget (some are long term and won't make it); 4) Fund geographically.

Table 3 shows a breakdown of funding options. A) Fund everything at some level; B) Fund projects where the costs are known for the next stage; C) Fund projects strategically to make the capital budget; D-1) Fund all City of Aberdeen dike projects, Mary's River and the waste water treatment plant (WWTP) project (focus on Aberdeen); D-2) Look at geographical locations: some in Aberdeen, Wishkah, Mary's River Lumber in Montesano. On page 6 Mr. Boettcher identified the pros and cons of funding in this manner.

Commissioner Averill was opposed (Column A) because there is not enough money for what is needed for any project. He thought the money should be used as efficiently as possible. Getting projects into the 2013 budget is important but that still leaves \$120,000 to extend on projects that might not make this list but might make the list in the future.

Mr. Gordon stated Wishkah Road is a major safety issue, as well as the Montesano WWTP. Those are the two biggest issues because they affect jobs and lives.

Mr. Estes stated in 2010 the City of Montesano joined Mary's River Lumber to develop a solution to keep the river bank stable. There was no money available to do the project. Currently about \$100,000 is needed to update that report and that would open the project to be shovel ready. It would be about a \$14 million project. There is a revetment around the WWTP and it will get by.

Commissioner Willis would like to see Column C get ready to move forward to the capital budget, and also consider D. There is a lot of support for Wishkah Road. If projects are combined it will be a way to save money if one group takes on all the projects. During the county committee meetings the group looked at basin-wide solutions. They also would like to see a comp plan for the projects to see how they would help basin-wide before anything is started.

Mr. Boettcher stated D-2 is the analysis for Wishkah as well as Mary's River Lumber, the WWTP and the dike certification. If there was a combined Request for Proposal (RFP) there might be some dike work picked up in Aberdeen which addresses safety and geography.

Chairman Raines stated the \$322,000 shows it is not all focused on upper basin projects and makes a geographic statement. D-2 works with a solution of \$35,000 for item 4. She would like to see C with \$87,000 for Wishkah.

Commissioner Valenzuela asked why a decision was being pushed for this afternoon. Mr. Boettcher stated he would like to get it into the capital budget and get going on projects that already have preliminary design work completed.

Commissioner Valenzuela did not believe there was enough information to do what Mr. Boettcher was asking. Mr. Kramer stated this morning's discussion was to see if there is enough information. Can the Flood Authority spend \$90,000 in three months?

Commissioner Willis stated we may not understand completely about a project but we can't get to the next step until there is a buy-in from the Flood Authority. Commissioner Valenzuela stated there is no project description and without that she does not know how to weigh in.

Mr. Boettcher stated the review and approval forms are not prepared yet; if the Authority makes a decision he would draft the forms and circulate them.

Mr. Kramer stated there did not seem to be enough information to move projects forward. All of these could go into the capital budget with sketchy information. He suggested that in the next three months the Flood Authority can decide what could be spent to advance these projects for funding through the capital budget. We can't spend \$90,000 on Wishkah in three months. It will take a month just to figure out who will do the contract. Projects 7, 8 and 9 are not close to submitting; the Authority could direct that these be taken off.

Commissioner Averill stated the money is good until July 2013. The two projects that are approved we had been working on for some time and had accumulated quite a bit of data. There is no design for projects in the lower basin. Getting the design work far enough long for the 2013 budget is not our only decision. If we can get some of that into the next budget that would be good. He is reluctant to suggest to the lower basin which projects are the priorities but he is hearing that there are a couple of projects that need consideration for safety issues and they should get into the capital budget. We have to spend some money to get the information we need.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated if the money is good until July then we don't need to spend the money in 90 days. There is pressure to start something and spending \$5 million is a challenge. There is under \$350,000 left in the levee and dike category and we need to determine the best use of that money.

Mr. Gordon suggested using some of that money for the Wishkah Road project design. When it is shovel ready there might be grants or other funding for construction.

After further discussion, the following options were proposed:

\$349,026 Remaining Levee category	Original Cost	B/C Hybrid	Modified by FA
1. Wishkah Road -with \$25,000 local hydraulic model	\$ 125,000.00	\$ 87,500	125,000
3. Southside Dike/Levee Certification	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000	50,000
4. Dike Bank of Wishkah North of Highway	\$ 47,000.00	\$ 47,000	47,000
5. Trail/Dike Behind Burger King	\$ 24,600.00	\$ 24,600	24,600
RESIDUAL Funding -----> 6. Market Street Dike	\$ 113,000.00	\$ 45,426	

13. [OFM Report] Revetment to Protect Montesano Rd, Sewage Treatment Plant and Mary's River Lumber (with \$35,000 refined hydraulic model)	\$135,000.00	\$ 94,000	102,000
--	--------------	-----------	---------

Totals:		\$ 349,026	348,600
----------------	--	-------------------	----------------

Notes:

- (a) Combine 1 and 13 under single alternatives analysis contract. Include Satsop alternatives analysis.
- (b) Package into a single review and approval form

\$500,000 Remaining Satsop Category	Cost
Satsop River Floodplain restoration	\$ 50,000

Mr. Gordon stated that Aberdeen could help do some of the work to bring the costs down.

5. Gage Maintenance

Mr. Boettcher stated the Flood Authority hired WEST to design the early warning system. That work included the installation of 11 gages. The last four are currently being installed and should be done within the next two weeks. There is a website which incorporates the flood inundation maps. Funding was for the installation and testing of gages and now the Operations and Maintenance (O & M) must be funded as OFM will not fund that portion. There are ten gages which require \$38,438 for O & M; one stream flow gages requires \$6,000. The website maintenance cost is \$3,800 and operation support is \$11,000 for a total of \$54,000 annually. Mr. Karpack has done work to update the Chehalis model and the flood inundation maps need to be updated.

Mr. Boettcher showed some options for funding gage maintenance and discussion followed. Some comments: Distribution of costs per county would not work because there is a gage in both Mason and Pacific Counties. WSDOT will not help with funding and Emergency Management is under-funded.

Mr. Boettcher stated a creative approach would be "adopt a gage" or local Public Works people could be trained by WEST to maintain the gages.

Mr. Kramer stated the funding is needed now; the creative solutions are not "now" solutions but they could be worked in over time. The only solution is some appropriation of the funding across the jurisdictions. He asked what each could agree to pay.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated there needs to be a short term and a long term strategy and we need to come up with \$53,000 now. The long term solution might be that the Flood Authority could task the ad hoc group with a budget request in the State budget to cover the cost.

Mr. Kramer stated that unless the gages can be funded and WEST is under contract soon there will be no maintenance this winter. He hoped the State would pick up the cost but it won't.

Commissioner Averill stated the Authority is not just learning this. Keith Phillips worked to get testing and calibration funded for a year. Lewis County has budgeted for this; not all jurisdictions have. He suggested rather than making one year's payment up front, do it by quarters; that way it can be put into the 2013 budget and the maintenance can still be done.

Commissioner Willis stated installment plans would be much more palatable. She also noted that a USGS gage on the Humptulips was taken out and there was public outcry. The fishermen use these

gages. If we are going to look at partners in the future, sports fishermen, charters, etc. might be worth considering.

Mr. Johnson has talked with Lewis County Public Works people about the maintenance of the gages. These are not typical gages; they are telemetry gages that are very sophisticated and Lewis County does not have people who are capable of maintaining them even with training.

Ms. Lee stated Pe Ell is in the process of working on its 2013 budget, which is very limited. It would be virtually impossible to come up with \$1000 in 2013. She also thought the gage funding should be picked up by Emergency Services.

Mr. Kramer asked if the allocations go down for the smaller jurisdictions, will the others be able to pay more per quarter. Commissioner Willis stated it can be brought up for discussion.

Chairman Raines stated there was quite a bit of difference between the actual cost and the rounded numbers. Mr. Kramer suggested asking the jurisdictions for the raw amount for a quarter. Commissioner Averill suggested asking for two quarters because we'll be into the State's second quarter in September.

Commissioner Valenzuela stated she would ask Thurston County about covering for Bucoda. Mr. Thompson stated Oakville has already approved its portion and if the council sees the raw number it is going to question it.

It was decided that letters would be sent out to all jurisdictions with the raw amounts so they can be budgeted.

6. Report on Chehalis Work Group Meeting

Mr. Kramer stated the work group, consisting of Chairman Raines, Commissioner Valenzuela, Chairman Burnett, J. Vander Stoep, and Jay Gordon, met with Keith Phillips and Governor Gregoire on August 10. The Governor is willing to put something into her budget if there is broad support for moving forward in the basin. The ad hoc committee should make recommendations to her and she needs support across the basin for projects to move forward that will significantly reduce flooding. The committee has until November 1.

Chairman Raines stated Governor Gregoire talked about I-5 and its importance and her goal is to protect the people. The Flood Authority is responsible for getting recommendations together and making them happen and she is eager to help.

Mr. Kramer stated the first meeting was largely procedural. The committee will meet every two weeks for the next three months and will be going through the various options and providing personal perspectives on what should happen based on the information they have, and try to develop a set of recommendations that the Governor might support. There are three things to be considered: large scale capital projects; local small scale capital projects and programmatic options; and changes that go along with preventing flooding and protecting people from flooding. Flood warning and gage maintenance would fit into that category. The Flood Authority will be kept informed and asked for their input throughout the process.

7. Discussion: Pe Ell Forum on Water Retention

Mr. Kramer stated that at the Pe Ell meeting some citizens asked for a forum to talk about a water retention dam to help people understand what it might mean to their community.

Ms. Lee stated she has been asked about safety issues. Her opinion was that it was premature to have a public meeting because more information is needed. The start of the permitting process is the time for a forum to discuss safety issues such as if there will be a warning system and who is going to monitor the dam. People in the community know a dam is being considered and what is known is now is readily available to community members.

Commissioner Averill stated comments have been made based on lack of information or a misrepresentation of information. While preliminary dam studies have been done they are not at the levels that lead to the turning of shovels or construction. There is no question that there is a need for more design and preparation studies before the construction phase. That could take a year or many years. Part of what the ad hoc committee is doing is determining if the dam should be pursued and if it is feasible.

Commissioner Valenzuela did not think a forum was premature. The Flood Authority should be available to the citizens so that they know more about this issue.

Chairman Raines stated the people in Pe Ell know this is an on-going discussion. They have had opportunities to discuss this through meetings across the basin. She does want to make sure that people know they can voice their opinions and know when the Flood Authority meetings are. It is premature to hold a discussion in a forum but the public needs to be aware of what is going on. The Authority has homework to do before a forum.

Commissioner Averill stated the dam has been discussed with the support of materials at public forums and the Chronicle has put maps, pictures and discussions in the paper. There is a citizen in Pe Ell on the Chehalis Basin Partnership who has repeatedly expressed his opinion on a local Lewis County radio talk show; there is no lack of information or opinion. The problem is we don't even know the answers to some of the questions that will be asked.

Ms. Fund stated the Education and Outreach Committee would want to schedule a forum when the time is right. In the meantime, the citizens can comment on the Ruckelshaus Report and there are other reports to read. It is on the committee's radar but there should not be a meeting until there is good information available.

Chairman Raines stated because of the extreme heat today public comment would be postponed until the business meeting and the tour would be conducted at the conclusion of the afternoon meeting.

The meeting recessed at 11:00.

1. Call to Order

Chairman Raines reconvened the meeting at 11:15 a.m.

2. Introductions

Self-introductions were made by all attending.

3. Approval of Agenda

Chairman Raines asked to add the tour under Item 10; add the Satsop project under Item 8; and delete Item 7 since it was discussed at the morning work session. The agenda was approved with the changes.

4. Approval of Meeting Notes

There were no changes to the meeting notes from July 19 and 26.

5. Public Comment

Mr. Jay Gordon commented on the issue of whether or not the Flood Authority should comment on the Ruckelshaus study. One thing that jumped out is that there was no discussion of leadership for the future. The Legislature wants to know what the leadership structure will be. He thinks it would be helpful to clarify this issue in the Ruckelshaus Report. There may be a time to form a FCZD and the Flood Authority knows what works and what doesn't.

Ms. Powe asked if Mr. Kramer wanted just comments on the Alternatives Report or if he wanted more stories. Mr. Kramer stated he is always interested in more stories.

6. Reports

a. Chair's Report

Chairman Raines stated she and Commissioner Valenzuela received a letter from Governor Gregoire thanking them for the Resolution recognizing the Governor for her work on the floods.

b. Member Reports

Grays Harbor County: Commissioner Willis reported that during the break she learned that the Conservation Commission has made contact with Thurston and Grays Harbor Counties to talk about what they need regarding critter pads.

Centralia: Ms. Fund stated the rain garden in Centralia has been completed; it is located on the corner of Tower and Center in Centralia next to Hub Bub.

Lewis County: Commissioner Averill reported that both the Flood Authority and the Tribe have approved the Adna project and OFM will release the funding for that project. It should be started within the month.

Oakville: Mr. Thompson stated the Harris Street culvert is about 50% complete.

d. State Team Report

There was no report.

8. Decision on Remaining Levee Funds

Mr. Kramer stated this morning the Flood Authority recommended how to use the remaining funding from the Levee/Dike Category:

Wishkah Rd	\$ 87,500
Southside Dike	50,000
Dike Bank of Wishkah	47,000
Trail/Dike Behind Burger King	24,600
Residual funding	45,426
Revetment	94,500
TOTAL	\$349,026

The Satsop River Floodplain Restoration is estimated at \$50,000. The review/approval for these projects will have two sections since the Satsop project is a different category.

Mr. Gordon stated that there is a possibility that Mary's River may get funding from USDA for engineering.

Commissioner Averill stated the funding is at 75% and Grays Harbor County should be able to come up with the difference. Commissioner Willis did not think so – the County can't count on other partners. She thought the funding for Market Street could be used to bolster some of the other projects. She reiterated that the Satsop project has to be updated.

Mr. Estes stated he was concerned that the money that might come from USDA will affect the oxbow and not have any effect on the bank at Mary's River Lumber. Montesano owns that property but it doesn't have the money to shore up the bank.

He asked if the Authority would be ready to move to signatures based on the descriptions. There was a thumb's up for that recommendation.

10. Confirm Next Meeting

The next regular meeting will be on September 20 in Aberdeen at the Rotary Lodge Pavilion.

Commissioner Averill stated any money for gage maintenance needs to go through Lewis County. Chairman Raines stated a letter would be sent out explaining the process.

Mr. Vanell distributed maps to the levee site.

11. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:22 p.m.