Chehalis River Basin Flood Control Zone District Special Meeting Minutes

Lewis County Commissioners Hearing Room 2nd floor of the Historic Courthouse 351 NW North St Chehalis WA 98532

Meeting Date:

February 12, 2020

Meeting Time:

2:00 pm

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chehalis River Basin Flood Control Zone District Supervisor Fund at 2:01 p.m., Wednesday, February 12, 2020. Those in attendance were:

Edna J. Fund Robert Jackson

Gary Stamper
Erik Martin

Jim Waldo

John Robinson Amber Smith

John Henricksen Bill Brumsickle Charles Coddington

Josh Metcalf Lara McRea Mark Glyde

J. VanderStoep

Rob Snaza Steve Lyle Colton Dodson

Anthony Mixer Frank Corbin Greg King Chehalis River Basin Flood Control Zone District Supervisor (by phone)

Chehalis River Basin Flood Control Zone District Supervisor Chehalis River Basin Flood Control Zone District Supervisor Chehalis River Basin Flood Control Zone District Administrator

Attorney, Gordon, Thomas, Honeywell, LLC

Chehalis River Basin Flood Control Zone District Consultant

Civil DPA, Lewis County Prosecutor

Chehalis River Basin FCZD Advisory Committee Member Chehalis River Basin FCZD Advisory Committee Member Chehalis River Basin FCZD Advisory Committee Member

Lewis County Public Works Director Interim Clerk, Board of Supervisors

Representative for the Quinault Indian Tribe

Lewis County Attorney Lewis County Sheriff

Citizen Citizen Citizen Citizen Citizen

II. Verification of a Quorum

There is a quorum of three district supervisors.

III. Introductions

Introductions were made.

IV. Approval of Minutes for January 22, 2020

Motion made by Supervisor Jackson to approve the minutes of January 22, 2020. Supervisor Stamper seconded the motion. Motion approved.

V. Public Comment

Greg King noted he is attending the meeting to be more informed of the proposed project.

VI. <u>Economic Impacts of Flooding Presentation-Matt Matayoshi</u>

Matt Matayoshi with the Lewis Economic Development Council (EDC) presented an economic analysis of flooding. He noted that he reviewed 25 studies and worked with a number of consultants to find economic impacts of flooding.

If there no action taken the economic impacts to the basin will be \$3.5 million over the next century. The source for this information is the programmatic EIS that was completed by the Department of Ecology. He noted that the figure does not take into account climate change.

He noted that Perteet Engineering did some analysis based on Hazus, which is modeling that FEMA recognizes to model damage but it is only as good as the input.

Without each 100-year flood and a flood reduction facility the damage would be \$336 million. Hazus takes into account the building and the contents of each building.

Running the flood reduction project through the matrix shows estimated building damages at just \$95 million, or a 72% reduction.

Matt discussed some of the challenges of coming up with the figures. He also noted his document is a draft document and he will have the final out soon.

He discussed the 2007 flood event and noted that federal and state government money recovery efforts added up to \$277 million to help communities recover.

Matt discussed transportation issues. The major floods that closed I5 occurred in years 1990, 2006, 2007, and 2009. Each time I5 was closed an average of 3 days per flood event.

DOT's projected impact to the economy is \$12 million per day as trucks are not moving. That is a \$36 million dollar impact over 3 days.

He said the biggest concern is the \$3.5 billion in impact if no action is taken.

Matt discussed how more frequent flooding affects businesses and said it creates an unpredictable environment.

He said there is no way to flood proof buildings such as the fairway center as elevation is an issue.

Further discussion was held regarding 100-year floods.

VII. Water retention facility cost/schedule

Erik updated the supervisors with the latest cost estimates and said the costs will be more defined later down the line. These are very preliminary numbers and there is still a lot of work to be done.

Many of the figures come from Anchor QEA's work during or after the programmatic EIS. This is a conservative approach.

In 2018 there was a presentation to the Office of the Chehalis Basin Board (OCB) which was around \$628 million which is a very conservative figure. There are also estimates which place the project in the \$300-\$400 million range.

Erik discussed that the State of Washington is funding the project as of right now and most of the funds have come out of the capital budget.

Erik discussed a bill that is up for a vote in the House which Representative DeBolt sponsored. This bill will create a pathway for funding for many years for come.

He went on to discuss future funding needs as the district will be looking at impact statements and potentially permitting.

Supervisor Stamper noted that this basin strategy is not just about the water retention facility but also about restoring aquatic species.

Supervisor Fund discussed HB 1154 and noted the funding will span 14 years. It is for \$700 million to be split between flood mitigation and aquatic species.

She discussed the differences in dams especially between Elwa Dam and a water retention facility.

Jim Waldo discussed the programmatic with changing climate patterns and the reason the project is referred to as a flood facility.

He explained how the water retention facility will work and noted that it will not be built for recreation or water supply but to reduce flooding.

He discussed maximizing the value of funds to mitigate the facility.

Frank Corbin asked if the \$700 million that the legislature passed will fund the \$628 million cost for the water retention facility.

Erik noted that half of the funds will be for flood damage prevention type of projects and the other half of the money will be spent on aquatic species restoration and planning. He also said that there will be a gap in the funding.

Frank asked if federal funding is an option and Supervisor Fund stated that anytime they go back to Washington DC, they lobby for flooding and aquatic species.

Erik discussed the fact that the Army Corps operates several water retention dams in western Washington and they assume control when public safety requires it.

VIII. <u>Draft State Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) public hearings</u>

Erik discussed the Department of Ecology flyer that discusses the public comment meetings.

There will be two meetings held. The first is on March 31 at the Centralia College and on April 2 at Montesano Junior/Senior High School. The open house is from 5:00 pm-8:30 pm and there will be a short presentation at 5:30 pm.

The draft state EIS will be published on February 27. The public can comment on Department of Ecology's website as well.

John Robinson noted the EIS document will be hundreds of pages and will have technical reports attached to it. Some of the topics will be land use, fisheries, soils and water quality.

The district will read the document and identify key areas to comment on. The district may disagree or agree with the areas but will write comments and submit to DOE. The district will have 60 days to comment.

DOE will collect all comments, organize by topic and respond accordingly but the district is not sure how long this will take.

Erik said a work session would be planned with the supervisors to discuss what was found and what the district would like to comment on.

He also said the district will be receiving one hard copy of the document but it will also be available online.

J. VanderStoep discussed the difference between this state EIS and the programmatic EIS that was done 2 years ago.

This alternative includes water retention and aquatic species enhancement.

The document will analyze the negative environmental impacts of just the proposed water retention facility.

The district will be producing the mitigation plan which will include a vegetation plan.

Jim Waldo said the vegetation management plan is out of the programmatic, but the district hasn't had time to develop it within DOE's schedule. The district will have a more sophisticated plan later.

The district's responsibility as project proponent is to minimize and avoid impacts.

Jim noted that this EIS does not look at the entire Chehalis Basin plan, only the proposed water retention facility and airport levee.

Erik said that the Department of Ecology will have some level of mitigation proposed in the document which may be high level.

Supervisor Fund noted the SEPA EIS document does not approve or deny the project. OCB and the District will use the information to make a decision.

IX. Jim Waldo's Contract

Erik reminded the supervisors that they authorized him to sign contracts up to \$770k last July and asked if that is still there intent. They all agreed. Erik said he will be signing Jim Waldo's contract for 2020 and the amount is \$108k for the year. There is also an extra \$12k added into the contract for extra expenses such as travel and mileage.

X. John Robinson's Contract

John Robinson's contract is \$73,500 for year with additional funds added for the EIS effort.

XI. .09 Funding Application

The district is working on an application for funding of \$700-\$800k for .09 distressed counties funding.

XII. HDR Contract

The amendment with HDR is \$385k for the EIS effort and JARPA preparation.

XIII. RCO Amendment #5

The district is waiting on the contract for funding of \$550k.

XIV. Resolution No. 20-001 Notice of Hearing for 2020 Budget Amendment

Supervisor Jackson made a motion to approve Resolution No. 20-001 notice of public hearing for the 2020 budget amendment. Supervisor Stamper seconded.

Erik reported that the budget amendment will increase revenues and expenditures by \$629,847. Approximately \$100k are carryover funds from 2019 for the districts RCO grants and \$550k for new funding from RCO. The hearing will take place on Wednesday, March 25 on or after 2:30 pm. The notice will be posted in the Chronicle on March 17 and March 21 and in the East County Journal on March 18.

Motion approved.

XV. Announcements

No comments.

XVI. Adjournment

Supervisor Jackson made a motion to adjourn, Supervisor Stamper seconded the motion. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 3:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara McRea Interim Clerk