



Meeting Minutes
Nisqually River Council Meeting
July 16, 2021
Online Meeting

Attendees

NRC Members:

Julie Rector – City of Lacey
Jeff Barney – Pierce County
Renee Skaggs – Pierce Conservation District
Michael Noone – Dept of Ecology

Glynnis Nakai - BFJNNWR
Cathy Hamilton-Wissmer – JBLM
Environmental Outreach
Larry Stickney – Pierce County Council
Terry Kaminski – Yelm City Council

CAC:

Ed Kenney
Martin McCallum

Lois Ward
Howard Glastetter
Paula Holroyde

Guests:

Aaron Pruitt
Wendy Shaw – FEMA
Jonathan Johnson – FEMA

Soumya Sagarika – FEMA
Ana Simoes – FEMA
Dale Meck – FEMA
Robin Buckingham

Staff:

Justin Hall - NRF
Ashley Von Essen – Nisqually LE
Sheila Wilson – NREP
Ian Stoner - NLT

Jeanette Dorner – NLT
Julia Fregonara – NREP
Kim Bredensteiner – NLT
Joanne Park - NRF

1. Call to Order, Introductions, Approval of Minutes and Agenda

Justin and Ashley tested out the new OWL Camera to test for future hybrid meetings.

David and Phyllis were unavailable today so Justin will be chairing in the interim. Justin called the meeting to order at 9:04am. Howard mentioned some corrections for the meeting minutes from the last meeting and said he submitted them to Joanne. Minutes were approved. Agenda has been set for today. This meeting was originally scheduled to be a retreat but it was changed to a meeting. The retreat is tentatively scheduled for September.

2. Committee Reports and Updates

Advisory Committee Reports:

CAC Report – Lois Ward

It was a wonderful meeting this past week although it was a very small group that attended. Ashley came to talk about the Nisqually Lead Entity and what that means for salmon recovery. It helped fill in the gaps for everyone and provide lots of great information. The CAC learned that there are 15 groups in the Puget Sound that provide salmon recovery for the area. There was discussion about the various projects throughout the watershed including Nisqually delta, the Mashel river, and the Ohop. The presentation was greatly appreciated and engaging. There was some discussion in regards to issues with the wastewater at Eatonville.

Ashley's presentation was followed by Glynnis who provided a report about the BFJNNWR. USFWS does not only oversees the Nisqually area but also Greys Harbor. There is a 3,800-acre watershed south of Black Lake that they are working to protect. There was a google map shared that showed cultural landmarks as well as efforts to control invasive species in all of these areas. It was a very informative discussion.

Using the map that was already pulled up, Howard used it to update everyone about his concern with the pile of fresh asphalt that Lakeside has down in the valley. There was discussion about how storing this asphalt out in the open is worse as it poses a risk to the water table and to the delta. Howard also pointed out the blowout concerns in the Nisqually Valley news and what kind of dangers there are to the dam.

There was an announcement about the annual picnic by Sierra Club this year. It will be an in-person event and will be at Kitchen #1 at Priest Point Park on August 4th from 5pm-7pm. Everyone is invited. They are hoping that there are representatives from various groups who will be able to share some updates on current projects in the watershed.

Howard added that he did some checking on the pile of asphalt. The hearing examiner never sent back any message as to what the results were. Howard sent an email to Glynnis where all the information was. There was a note from Lakeside saying they will take evasive action to do some testing every month. On that note, Glynnis relayed that issues that are off-refuge are passed along to the ecological services office since they are the regulatory arm for USFWS. She passed on this information.

Allied Program Reports:

Nisqually Land Trust - Jeanette Dorner

There wasn't anything huge to report this month. There is ongoing stewardship work as well as ongoing conversations and various acquisitions going on throughout the watershed. NLT had a board meeting last night and they are happy to report that their auditor came back with a clean audit report. They are also working on updating their strategic plan and are making good progress and making good strategies. When that is more ready, they will be sharing to get some feedback before finalizing with their partners.

NREP - Sheila Wilson

Summer Institute was a success and part of the first day was canceled due to the heat. Cindy Donahue talked about the ANeMoNe network and she wants to work with students to do some water quality monitoring. Participants also went to the Nisqually Cultural Center for the day and teachers had a chance to hear some stories from Hanford and his family. Teachers also learned about benthic macroinvertebrates, salmon dissection, and salmon life cycle. It was a great event despite the heat.

A recent NREP staff retreat was spent figuring out who will be responsible for what as their team will be growing. They are hiring two Americorps members this year. The NCLI grant is active and they are planning on two separate campouts. Wa He Lut has also hired a new teacher.

Nisqually River Foundation - Justin Hall

Between last meeting and this meeting, there are some grants they have been working on for Muck Creek. They are putting together a queue for a contractor for this project. Yesterday was Maya's last day and there was a going away party for her. Justin also went on vacation with his wife recently. This week, he has been catching up on emails and getting to the end of year going for state grants.

Community Forest - Justin Hall

CF is currently harvesting and are doing a baseline survey for a carbon project. There was a meeting yesterday with Hancock's security person about gates. They looked at different locations for gates. Kirk Hampton from Natural Resource Group did a rapid assessment for resource purchases. They are working with tribal members to do an assessment of the new purchases so there will be some more to report on at the next meeting.

3. PSAR Rapid Response Funding Update

Kim Bredensteiner, NLT

For those that have been paying attention to the real estate market, they will notice it is a very hot market right now and that means that land values have been increasing pretty substantially. What would have been enough money in early 2020 is no longer enough money to get the conservation easement done. NLT is asking the NRC to be a part of their request to the PSAR Rapid Response Fund for additional funding for this project.

[Started recording here].

The rapid response fund is a fund that was created to address acquisition opportunities that are high priorities and create a rapid funding response. It is a revolving fund so the funds need to be repaid to the rapid response fund to the following biennium funds. In this particular case, they are coming to the Nisqually LE for a project that is outside the watershed boundaries but it is a project of particular interest for Nisqually salmon. It has been supported by LE and the Nisqually salmon recovery program in putting together the project for the last 4 years. They

are also coming to the NLE for support because the Nisqually Natural Resources Department has been involved in the project in a way that was not involved in the past.

In terms of the location of the project, a map was shared of where Sound View Camp is located. It is 93 acres and sits along the shoreline just up from Devil's Head. It includes an interesting set of nearshore habitats including a spit and a small pocket estuary behind that spit. It is 2 miles south of Longbranch. The camp itself has been run as a youth and family camp for about 50 years. Current landowner has owned it for about 30 years and prior to that, it was a camp as well. It is outside the shoreline that is directly connected to the darker blue area on the map. The darker blue area on the map is the Nisqually Reach Aquatic Reserve. This property does contribute to the reserve. The blue and white dotted line is the marine conservation initiative boundary. The area inside it was chosen because all of the land masses drain into the aquatic reserve area.

The project includes a spit system. There is just under a mile of shoreline, pocket estuary, active feeder bluffs on the south part of the property, and a vegetative bluff system on north side of property. The little openings that you can see from the aerial photo are active areas of the camp.

The ecology of the area was shown through a photo, which also showed a line for the northern part of the property. There is documented surf smelt, sand lance, and herring spawning and rearing offshore outside of the tidelands. The pocket estuary is very important for juvenile salmon in terms of physiological transition and rearing habitat.

If they are not able to move forward with this conservation project, it is likely that the owners of the camp will decide that they are not able to continue to run the camp and sell the property for residential development. It is in an area of the key peninsula that allows one in ten development. The yellow sketch on top of the map shown is what it would look like for highest and best use of the property. It will be divided into 9 resident lots and could potentially end up with homes in each line. The negotiations with the landowner is to make the property look different from this. The goal of the project is to make sure that the area near the shoreline is considered the maximum protection area. The project will ensure that the maximum protection area cannot be subdivided in the future. Any camp areas and any new camp buildings would have to be inside the minimum protection area. There would also be two development rights left with the property – one is the camp manager building and they would be leaving a second development right with the camp at this point. If the camp were to choose to use that other development right, they would need to do that within the minimum protection area. The camp is actively using the pier but another thing they wrote into the conservation easement document is that NLT and its partners would have affirmative restoration rights. This would allow them to be able to work with the camp to come up with opportunities to do restoration projects throughout the maximum protection area that is not actively being used by the camp. It gives them a lot of opportunities for partnership out there.

In terms of funding, NLT secured \$1.8 million which was a combination of funding from NCWCG, ESRP, PCCF, NIT, and some private funding. Covid happened since then so the negotiations were impacted by that. During that time, land values have been increasing. They

estimate that they are about \$400k short to complete the conservation easement. They are limited in terms of timing because the other funding sources need to be spent by the end of 2021 and they are trying to figure out how to fill that gap. This application for rapid response funds is for \$250k. They requested and have received some support from private funding for \$100k. They are currently in the process of requesting \$50k from the Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program as a Cost Increase. This brings them to the \$400k additional funding that they would need to complete the conservation easement.

They do have landowner support for the conservation easement structure. The negotiations are all but done which is fantastic given the fact that the property is owned by the Presbytery of Olympia. Their structure is quite complicated in terms of all the people who need to be involved in negotiations. The funding partners are very supportive of the current conservation easement and the \$1.8 million in federal, state, and local funding is already secured but does go away at the end of 2021. This is why they are coming back around and asking PSAR and NLE to consider this request. It would mean that NLE would need to repay the \$250k to the rapid response fund out of the 2023-2025 biennium allocation for PSAR. As a salmon recovery funding board project sponsor, NLT recognizes that this impacts future opportunities for projects. However, NLT and their partners would be very disappointed to not be able to see this project through to completion.

There was a time for questions. Ashley added that Kim presented at the July NWSHG meeting and they did approve the request for this application. Now it is in NRC's hands for the final say. The Land Trust and the Lead Entities will need a letter of support that they would send to the Puget Sound Partnership in order to move forward on these funds. There were no further questions and there was a motion to approve the project.

There was a lot of appreciation shown for NLT staff for working so hard for all the time and energy they invested into this project.

Martin asked a question in the chat about new restoration projects on McNeil Island and if they are within the Nisqually Reach Aquatic Reserve. Ashley did not have a lot of information on potential restoration projects currently. Martin mentioned that it would be good news if there was restoration occurring there as salmon frequent the shores there. They do want to see it protected and restored but those new projects are coming along.

4. Salmon Recover Project Ranking Update

Ashley Von Essen, Nisqually LE

Each year, the Nisqually LE is tasked with allocating funds that come down from the legislature. These are salmon recovery funding board dollars and Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration dollars. The PSAR dollars are only every other year. This year, they are only talking about the surfboard funding. In March, there was a list of four projects that were moving forward with the funding as their applications had been submitted. Now, this presentation will be sharing a list of those projects prioritized for NRC's approval.

Surfboard was allocated \$40 million for this biennium, which means instead of receiving the estimated \$375k, they will actually be receiving \$418,610. They will also be eligible for the same amount next year in the 2022 grant round. Four letters of intent (LOI) were submitted to Nisqually LE so those four projects will be shared in more detail later on in this presentation. This made for a total grant request of \$446,778. The basic match that is acquired is about 15% which brings the total project cost close to half a million dollars.

The #1 project that came through the grant round this year is from the NLT. This is an enveloped project – they are pursuing acquisition in this area and one of them has already been secured. The entire envelope itself totals 12 properties totaling about 36 acres, right in the middle reach of the Nisqually.

The second project is the Lower Ohop Protection 2021 also from NLT. Grant request is about \$130k. There are 2 sites within this project. A map was shown to show the two different sites. Property A is 0.2 mile of Ohop Creek shoreline and approximately 10 acres of floodplain. Property B is 0.1 mile of Ohop Creek shoreline and approximately 1.4 acres of floodplain. The larger properties are outlined in orange and NLT is pursuing acquisitions in the white-hashed lines.

The third project is the Nisqually River McKenna Reach Protection 2021. They are hitting home runs this year as they are pursuing a parcel in McKenna Reach – it is about 12 acres, along .26 miles of mainstem shoreline. Their grant request is just under \$75k. If you look at it on the map, the orange portion on the bigger map and the white hashed line in the smaller picture.

Last but certainly not least is the Mashel River Design and Assessment project. This project had a bit of a cost increase. This project is doing some assessment work. It was flagged by the surfboard review panel because they just wanted some more information about the assessment. The sponsor, South Puget Sound Enhancement Group, just needed to obtain more information. The designs and the assessment was intended but it wasn't necessarily made clear in the application according to the panel members. The project manager, Brian Combs, fixed that piece of the application but also put in a little extra money to show that designs will come out of there. So this project saw a cost increase of \$30k since the initial application. There was a map to show two areas of focus for restoration designs. The first one is the bridge that Mashel River crosses between Pack Forest property and the State Parks. They are thinking about taking the bridge out and opening up a floodplain there, letting the river do what it wants to do. Then, you can see below there is road fill and bank armor in the Nisqually main stem. They are potentially looking at removing these as well to let the river do what it wants to do.

A timeline was shared to show where Nisqually LE is at with the grant timeline. Obviously, applications have already been turned in, there have been site visits, there have been phone calls with the review panel to follow up, applications have been revised, and then all those projects have been ranked by NSHWG. This list is due to the RCO on August 9th. They are hoping to gain the approval of NRC for the list of projects shared. Then finally, the SRFB funds are awarded at the end of September.

There was a time for questions. When there is property being purchased along the river, is there a minimum amount that makes it worth your while to purchase those properties? This question was passed along to NLT and they answered the question. They tend to look for ways to make sure that if they are looking small properties that will be standing all on its own, it may not be worth acquiring. When they take a look at properties, they typically ask questions about the location, if it helps restore habitat, and whether or not it blocks or buffers other property that is already protected. These questions help them decide if it is property worth acquiring. Another question was asked about the recent FEMA review of the river which was a perfect transition into the next presentation.

[Break]

Everyone was welcomed back from break and there was a motion to approve the ranking list of projects that Ashley shared. Lois moved to approved and Howard seconded. The funding list was approved by NRC.

5. FEMA Risk Mapping Presentation

Wendy Shaw, FEMA

Wendy thanked NRC for inviting them to share. They just released the preliminary maps on June 25th so now they are currently under review and they are working on scheduling meetings with each of the counties – Pierce, Thurston, and Lewis. Once they get them scheduled, she will ask NRC members at the end of the meeting if they are interested in attending so she can send them more information. These meetings will go into a lot more detail than this presentation.

She introduced herself, who is with FEMA Region 10, as well as the rest of her team. This presentation is intended to be more of an overview of what they did but if there are technical questions along the way, the entire team is present to answer some of those questions. A brief overview of what will be discussed in this presentation was shared including some background information, methodologies, significant map changes, non-regulatory products and resilience, floodplain regulations, map adoption process, and then a little bit on public outreach.

There was an overview of the Risk MAP Process. Risk MAP stands for Risk Mapping, Assessment, and Planning. This pretty much covers what they do as they look at the maps, they do the engineering assessments, and then they are hoping to inform planning with that data. This goes through a long process that they call the S-curve, which shows the process and timeline. The idea here is that they want to make sure they are producing high quality data, information that is actually useable, and talk about this long-term hazard mitigation planning. They address questions like, how do we mitigate floods? How do we protect people from building in areas that could be flooded? How do we keep with habitat? How do we make sure our systems are healthy? They are helping with information for the whole system. There is some regulatory work that they have and they tend to be flood-focused but they can also provide assessments when it comes to landslides and earthquakes. Though this S-curve

process, you will see they go from talking about what your needs are, such as what you need to know about your watershed. They do all the engineering and modeling, which means they are collecting surveys. Once the initial modeling is done, they do the flood risk review, which is where they really dive into the details with the engineering team. Right now, they are at the preliminary map release, which means they have vetted a lot of the engineering so far and they are ready to release it to the public and receive public input on these maps. After that time, there is a 90-day appeal period once it is published in the federal register. There is 90 days to produce those comments and appeals. Then, comes the adoption process, which counties and local floodplain administrators will be heavily involved in. Once it is all done, then you get the effective maps. It is a long, detailed process with many points along the way where they try to get input from everyone.

Beyond the process, it is not just a map or a flood insurance rate map. They also have data and they determine how they use it to inform flood risk awareness, to communicate to people that they could be in a flood zone, and what they are susceptible to. A lot of times it is important to know what would be affected. They want to promote community mitigation actions and supporting those who are trying to do the right thing and trying to preserve the watershed. They want to make sure water flows where it needs to go without affecting structures and people along the way.

There is a Washington State Risk MAP website for those curious about other risk MAP projects happening around the state. Jerry Franklin, out of the Washington Department of Ecology, is the Risk MAP coordinator. He maintains this website so you can click around the map to see locations of other projects in varying degrees of in the process along the way. FEMA Region 10 does Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Alaska so they are spread out pretty widely. For anyone interested, there will be a PDF sent out with active links for anyone interested in viewing this interactive site.

There is a lot of approximate analysis, meaning they did not actually collect survey in the stream but they did determine the hydrology and the amount of water in the area and where it goes. If you are familiar with FEMA floodplain maps, the approximate analysis is a Zone A so there is no published base flood elevations there. However, because this is a digital product, they will provide a database and within that database, those elevations are available. Even if there is not a base flood elevation published on the map, you can still access elevation information. The detailed analysis that they covered has all the survey and structures included in the models including base flood elevations and floodway. Muck and South Creek in Pierce County were added later after they had originally started the project so they only just now went through the draft map phase. There is a little more work on those before they catch up to the rest of the project.

The study progress was shared. Discovery is where it all starts which happened back in May 2011. Sometimes it takes some time to get the funding together especially since federal funding can take longer than other types of funding. The field survey that they did for the Nisqually River happened in the Spring of 2018. Through 2020, that is where they had a lot of their flood risk review meetings for the watershed where they deep dive into the engineering and take into account everything that was happening along the way. In June, the preliminary

maps were issues. They are shooting for the Consultation Coordination Officers (CCO) meetings in August 2021, which will meet separately with each of the counties. This is to discuss how to take these maps to the public and how to do that as we are in a weird space now with COVID. They are trying to figure out if the meetings will be virtual or in-person or hybrid. The important thing is that the public is aware that these maps exist, that they are being released, and that they are changing in order to get their feedback. They are looking to get that public meeting set up this Summer or later in the Fall.

Some of the engineering analysis was also reviewed. Fortunately, the Nisqually River has gauges that they can use so they were able to get a lot of good data. There is some snippets here that were shown through some photos to show hydraulic methods. One of the photos shown was taken in 2020 after the floods. They want to make sure that people know they have tried to take into account actual floods that have happened to show confidence in their modeling, they know where floods happened before, and they are able to reproduce that in the models. The lower image shows a little bit of how they improve on the engineering. When they do an approximate analysis, they don't actually get the survey in the river. When they do survey, they are able to get much better information.

Floodway is designated to pass the fastest, deepest water of the stream. The way they do that is by encroaching and shrinking in the floodplain to see where the elevation change exists in the water. Ideally, they can move in to where there is no change at all. This is helpful when it comes to managing the floodplains and managing development. The entire purpose of a floodway from FEMA's perspective is we know people are going to want to develop and build in floodplains. They want to know how it helps inform people what it would do to the water, what it would do to the floodplain, and how it would affect people who live upstream and downstream. Developing these floodways helps the management part of that understand that in this area this is where the fastest, deepest water is going to be and this is where you don't want changes.

What do these changes mean? At the mouth of the Nisqually River, they attached a coastal study that was done a while back so they had to take into account the tides. They looked at how those two river models come together and how do they make sense. In the red, those are the base flood elevations and that is also the floodway. This shows you where that fastest, deepest water is on the maps directly. When all the maps come in the database, there is a lot more information in it like depths. As you move upstream, there is the Nisqually Reservation where a floodway has been added. The yellow area on the old maps was Zone D which is unknown flood risk. Now, they have a much better understanding as far as the modeling goes to where the flood plains would be. Moving again upstream towards McKenna, you can now see there is better modeling, better data and a floodway. While the floodway does give us a lot of information, it also provides some restrictions sometimes. They want to make sure that the public and those who are managing the floodplain at the community level have a better understanding of what is happening out there and what that means. Then, more upstream near Harts Lake, there is much more improved modeling with the floodway and floodplain based on recent events that are now filled in that were not captured correctly in the first effort.

There was a chart shown of the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) impacts. One of the biggest ones is that they added a floodway. A floodway comes with additional information restrictions as far as building and things like that. This can be a huge impact to anyone who has a structure that is currently in a Zone A and now, in a Zone AE with a floodway. When it comes to informing the public, they help come up with postcards or mailers that help describe exactly what this means to homeowners, residents, and business owners. When they have the CCO meetings, they also bring on insurance folks too so that there is some direction information there. And then, when they have the public meetings, they have the relevant people prepared to answer those questions in those meetings. It highlights who is impacted and how many people are impacted on this mapping update.

They have also developed maps all available to the public. They are open to everyone and you can click on these links to view them. It shows them where the study happened, where they started, how they scoped it, and what changes were made along the way so you can really follow the progression throughout each county. Pierce County has a flood comparison tool and it's a slide bar so you can compare between old and new flood plains. Lewis County doesn't have that because they didn't have a digital product beforehand. They are only able to do that when they have the digital versions ahead of time. The life cycle viewers also have information on what was the effective map and then another tab for the updated maps so it is available in both places.

They have done risk reports before for both Pierce and Thurston County. This hopefully directly informed the hazard mitigation plans that are out there for the counties and the communities. Any flood update that they would do, they are always happy to rerun to figure out impacts based on those hazards.

As a participating member of the NFIP (National Flood Insurance Program), there are benefits to being a part of this program. They always encourage everyone to obtain flood insurance whether they live in a floodplain or not because it is not included in regular home insurance. You never really know what is going to happen. They do try to provide risk assessments and allow people to get ahead of it but it is also important to make sure that folks are aware of their insurance needs and think about who should have it and who could be at other risk. The floodplain administrators for each of the communities has this information readily available.

Where are we now? Right now, they are in the "inform the community" phase. The preliminary maps are out there and they are just now rolling them out to the public. NRC is the first group outside of the government agencies that have seen the links. Wendy expressed hope that NRC would share the links that were shared widely. The more people that can see these ahead of time and the more people that are informed of what's happening, the better comments and information they get and the less people are surprised. They would much rather people be fully aware of these things than be surprised. Again, informing the community, gathering comments, and any additional data to have a formal appeal that requires a significant scientific change to things. For example, maybe there is a better survey that they didn't have or there is flow data that they could have missed somewhere along the line. Once the appeal period is closed and they take a look at the floodplain ordinances, the maps are then adopted which will then be used for grants and other things.

The community outreach is huge for them. They are not doing full public meetings yet but they want to make sure people are aware and they know how to access them if they have questions. There are lots of different ways to do that. They have done virtual story maps through GIS, which walk everyone through the process. It is set up with different tabs online so you can click on an insurance tab and get a little video that describes what is happening. There is also another link where it takes you to a request space where you can put in your address and a map can be sent to residents that show the flood zones and changes to them. There are a lot of different ways to get the community engaged through the virtual world if they are unable to do an in-person meeting. They like to do Facebook live events, virtual town halls, public access TV announcements, and radio announcements. The idea here is they are here to help folks receiving the maps how to get the word out and how to communicate it.

There was a time for questions. Howard mentioned he would like to receive more information about this and asked to be invited to the CCO meeting. He mentioned there was an article in the Nisqually Valley News about blowouts from glaciers and the Alder Lake Dam run by Tacoma Power is now 2 feet below capacity. The article is an interview with a Mt. Rainier spokesman who warns about potential blowouts. He had concerns about flooding that could occur as a result of blowouts and suggested another area that should be studied. Wendy appreciated Howard's perspective. The models that they generate can easily be used as base models to be used towards additional scenarios. When the county is looking at a hazard mitigation plan, they can run a few scenarios like if there was a dam that could flood. Their models are absolutely acceptable to be used for that purpose and could help provide some comparisons. Howard shared a few more concerns about how Tacoma Power is running their dam and Justin suggested that they can put together another meeting to further discuss these concerns.

There was a question in the chat. The rangers at Mt. Rainier are quite aware of the glacial outburst events common on the South Tahoma and Kautz glaciers in MRNP. Have they been contacted to construct this model? They have likely not been contacted as this is categorized as an extreme event which is not necessarily how they would model their 1% annual chance event, which is where their focus is. However, it does not mean that they cannot build off of the data that they have as it is all applicable towards the more extreme event scenario modeling. They are happy to talk to others looking more into this modeling as there are opportunities at their region to do that. It is definitely worth the discussion but not necessarily part of developing the flood insurance rate maps.

There was a project timeline shown projecting when they expect the maps to be effective. Right now, they are projecting the maps to become effective in Spring 2023 so there is still some time before those come into effect. The final slide highlighted the available team that are happy to answer questions and clarify anything. They are also figuring out how to move forward with the public so any suggestions are welcome. If anyone has technical questions, they are also welcome to ask any one of the team members listed on this slide.

Terry put on her real estate broker hat and asked a question in terms of properties following up with what Howard asked about earlier. She works in the Yelm area and part of the 1996 flood

is thought of a man-made flood in this area because of what happened with the dam. To clarify about the mortgage part, if you are buying property that is on the river, they will put a halt to your loan if you don't have really good flood insurance and it can be very costly. Currently there have been a lot of calls coming into the county asking about properties close to the river and if that property is buildable. It has been difficult for a lot of those property owners because there hasn't been a lot of information available as they had to wait for the FEMA review to give them more data. The question was asking about any compensation programs for those who might lose the total value of their property due to the FEMA maps. There was an additional question asking if they will be sending letters to those who live on property near a river. This may be something they can offer to the counties by coordinating activities through the floodplain administrators as they are much more aware of what is needed in their county. They can provide mailers and flyers showing the new flood zones. For those who may have lost value in their property due to it being inside a flood zone, there are still a lot of options for them. There can also be conversations of what you can do with that property now. They can take a look at whether or not their entire property is in the floodway or if there are portions of it in the floodplain, there are a lot of other solutions to consider.

NLT offered to work closely with Terry on some of those properties on the river. With this new mapping, they asked if it changed eligibility for federal funding for buyout programs for property owners who suddenly find that their classification has changed and realized it is not a safe place to build. How does this affect eligibility? They would need to look at it on a parcel-by-parcel basis as the changes are going to be different and affect people differently. If there is a particular parcel to take a look at, FEMA is happy to coordinate those questions to their insurance contacts and hazard mitigation grant program contacts who might be dealing with some of those grants that could be part of the buyout program. It will be affected in some way but FEMA could not really answer this question without knowing more specifics as the answer just varies based on circumstances. It seems that there is potential depending on what is going on with the individual property to access. There is better information and data now to be able to make a more informed decision.

With the changes in restoration projects, there is the whole no level rise. How does that all tie into this and with the new FEMA risk maps and what can we look forward to in the future? There will be a change but officially the maps that you refer to are the effective maps. However, using the preliminary data that they have, they can send those models out to whoever is doing the engineering and the analysis for the projects. They can start comparing the differences as well as considering whether the new maps are going to be more conservative to be able to make an informed decision. For example, a project can possibly look at different location for placing large wooded debris based on the data provided by the effective maps. There is better information now to help make better decisions. They have tools and resources that is useful but it is really difficult to know what the impact will be until they know for sure.

If there are meetings that come up, Wendy was asked to let NRC know so we can pass the message along beyond NRC. Once they have organized the public meetings, they will let us know what is happening and send a message along. Wendy was thanked for her informative

presentation. She introduced her team members that were present for the meeting and left the meeting.

6. For the Good of the Order

Rene talked about some of the projects she has been busy working on as she has not been able to attend an NRC meeting in a while. PCD still has some USDA/NRCS Resource Conservation Partnership Program funding that they would like to spend before mid-summer next year. If there are any agricultural related projects, please contact Renee because they want to spend that money and get some projects in.

The Executive Director for NLT has stepped down this year when he got elected to Pierce County Council. They are in the middle of getting ready to launch a job announcement. There is a search committee putting together a job announcement. They are hoping to release it sometime in August and wanted to put the word out there for anyone who would be interested in the position.

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:12am.

*Next meeting: Friday, August 20, 2021
Online*