

MEETING MINUTES – 5.22.24 at 9:00AM
Flood Control District 9 Commissioner Meeting
Old Courthouse – Commissioner’s Room
206 S. 1st Ave, Hailey, ID 83333

CALL TO ORDER, ESTABLISH QUORUM: Meeting called to order by Hovencamp at 9:03am. Commissioners Dean Hovencamp, Bryan Dilworth, and John Wright present.

Also present:

Molli Linnet – FCD9 admin

Ryan Colyer – Biota Research and Consulting (via video call)

Jeff Phillips – Biota Research and Consulting (via video call)

Chris Corwin – Blaine County Emergency Manager

Cory McCaffrey – Wood River Land Trust

Amanda Bauman – Project Bigwood

Larry Shoen – former County Commissioner, Consultant

Jim Kuehn – Hiawatha

Jim Phillips – Hiawatha

Aaron Golart - IDWR

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (ACTION ITEM): Wright proposes 3 changes to 4.24.24 minutes. Added “Wright” and “Jones and Demille” to NRCS PL566 Program section, and requested clarification from Colyer on comments regarding Green LiDAR. After clarification, Colyer’s Green LiDAR comment changed to “overall very helpful and informative”. Wright makes motion to approve minutes with changes. Dilworth seconds. Passes unanimously.

FINANCIALS: - ACTION ITEM(S):

Paid Bills to Approve Since Last Meeting:

- Molli Linnet Invoice #808
- Kathleen Lee Invoice #7008
- Biota Invoice #19369 – Zinc Spur

Bills to Be Paid:

- Molli Linnet Invoice #809
- Molli Linnet Reimbursements
- IME Invoice
- SIF
- PO Box Renewal

SAP UPDATES: none

ACTION ITEM (New Business):

Gin Ridge Letter (Project Bigwood) – John Wright and Amanda Bauman

Letter

Wright: larger discussion, not just about the letter. Davermen property turned in application back in August. (reads from letter) Brockway states in letter that FCD9 has not been taking broad approach to addressing issues. Accuses us of not pursuing work out there. Golart, I’m glad you’re here, since you’re on the application and you’re asking for a formal comment from us. I

propose our response is “yes, we’re addressing a reach wide approach” and will you give us more time to get our ducks in a row? That’s my request of the board.

Hovencamp: I’ve called Davermen twice and no response back. He’s the agent of the trust, not the person who lives in the house.

Bauman: I heard that Daverman lives there.

Wright: report is quite lengthy on all his efforts to make berms

Dilworth: when I was appointed to board in ‘17 I read the statues. The reason the Boise River is the way it is is because they use the river for recreation. The FCD has cart blanche. BC has stopped us from doing much of anything – they say it’s a wild and scenic river. The citizens have very little access to it. I organized neighborhoods to burn woody debris, and fire dept wouldn’t give us a permit. I was offended by that letter.

Wright: I make a motion that we send a letter to IDWR regarding this Davermen property permit and ask for a delay to give us an opportunity to respond and explain our current effort to address a larger reach.

Hovencamp seconds.

Wright: the report, it’s a laundry list of failed projects out there. And description of just another project that’s longer. He says it continues to happen. Not once does he ask why it’s happening. Why are we going to continue to address things with these little piecemeal projects and not address what’s happening upstream?

Hovencamp: I don’t think we are.

Wright: this is not about 1 or 2 little projects, this is a much bigger reach. Why is Gimlet the dumping ground for all the gravel, where is the gravel coming from? What happened in ‘12? River comes through there with a ton of velocity and gravel and dumps everything.

Hovencamp: that’s a point that Colyer should address in his investigation

Wright: the discussion here was about sending out a letter to the affected parties, but we don’t actually have a definition of the goals. We need to define the scope of the project prior to writing the letter. Include the points upstream where the gravel is getting picked up.

Hovencamp: letter is delayed because we’re waiting for info from Colyer. Their job is to do the design and engineering. We need their input.

Colyer: the project is a collab with FCD9, Project Bigwood, WRLT, and I feel like there’s differing opinions on where it should start. Important for parties to agree on project reach and then we can outline purpose and need and overall project objectives. We like to have that in writing at beginning of project for clarity. Then we can provide mailing info we discussed at last meeting and move forward from there w/the letter.

McCaffrey: I think what I’m hearing Wright say is that we need a clear delineation of project

Wright: my only point was the shortcomings of this Daverman project here and that we must expand ours.

Shoen: I apologize that I’m late and missing all the context, but the classic approach to this is that you have a homeowner that raises an issue and you address that without regards to anything else because you’re in an emergency. What you’re talking about here is a much larger scale which is great, but keep in mind how it will affect everything up and downstream and your resources because you won’t be able to address everything all at once. Different than immediate protective view that is traditional.

Colyer: Some think outreach should occur early and some think we should wait until more info. Work itself should take about 2 months

Bauman: I suggest that one person from each stakeholder should meet and nail down these details

J Phillips: Bend upstream of the bridge. You need to draw the line somewhere. Usually there's the specific reach, and then here are the sub-reaches.

Shoen: you're not paying for a mammoth engineering study of whole river. To Colyer's point, I always think it's better to do more outreach than less. Folks tend to get resentful if they find out after the fact that their home is part of a study. Explain WHY. To J Phillip's point, make the point that this is being impacted by something happening upstream – gives basis for future action.

Bauman: I agree with Shoen AND we need to define the scope first.

Hovencamp: I agree with you and I'd like to get this thing moving.

Bauman: we could schedule a meeting for next week now.

McCaffrey: I've been working on a letter, and we decided you all were going to review it. Step 1 is defining extent. We decided we wanted to have site meetings with homeowners. Colyer and I agree on what that extent should be - start at hospital bridge and scour hole and go down through boxcar. There are a couple other projects above that have SAPs going, but I don't think that gives us the opportunity.

Bauman: I think there's important stuff happening above scour hole

Meeting set for 9:00AM Friday, May 24th. Bauman will send google meet link.

Hovencamp: Colyer was going to outline a list of problems. Bauman and McCaffrey?

McCaffrey: I'm keeping the language soft, we have enough for the letter. Bauman's working on survey portion – hope to keep it to 5 questions or less

BC paid for Atlas

ACTION ITEM (Old Business):

Website Update – John Wright

Wright: wanted to keep the ball rolling on this – at last meeting we decided to look over information and then make a decision.

Linnet: communicated with Colyer and his co-worker's wife's website hosting company does not have the bandwidth to take on any more clients. So it's just between Streamline and Wix.

Streamline is designed for helping taxing districts and has lots of support but is \$100/month. Wix is much more basic and has less support but is only \$30/month and it looks like it has all capabilities we need.

Dilworth: you're the one who's going to be doing it. Does Wix sound good to you?

Linnet: As long as you're OK with it likely taking me more time upfront to get the initial setup done, then yes.

Wright makes motion to make a FCD9 website using Wix.com. Hovencamp seconds. It passes unanimously.

Hiawatha – John Wright, Jim Phillips and Jim Keuhn

Wright: discussion in past was you were looking for funds for modeling, and we said no because we wanted better understanding of scope. I spoke with your engineer and asked how difficult it would be to include land on other side of road right of way. He said easy and simple, add some expense. I would be willing to help chip in if the scope expanded.

Kuehn: initially asked for \$10k for that modeling. Nick (engineer) has not updated me on your conversation about the larger scope. The scope we looked at was Lufkin bridge below Zinc Spur. We're running out of time with grant opportunities. That scope is good for you and mandatory for us and time is of the essence.

Wright: I felt the project you were proposing was not including all causes of flooding. Needs to include other side of the highway 75. If canal overflows it will go there, and that's the real risk for FCD9 so scope needs to include that

Kuehn: my understanding was that you had specific idea of what to do with overflow. Nick can't come up with solution until he can do modeling. We want to have engineered fix in place so that it doesn't happen again. We've got 1 grant in place and we can't move ahead. We've paid for survey for that reach.

Hovencamp: you are requesting \$10k for modeling?

Kuehn: Yes

Shoen: if you're contributing to engineering study, you might want to see engineers report on work, cost and impact to your areas of concern to address your questions. This seems very haphazard. You want to see everything in writing before committing.

Kuehn: Takes in Lufkin to Zinc Spur and \$10k is total modeling cost

Shoen: so you're being asked to pay the entire cost of modeling?

Hovencamp: when can we get scope confusion resolved so we can tell engineer what we want done.

Kuehn: I'm sorry that I wasn't present at your meeting with Nick (to Wright), because we could have answered that

Wright: I apologize. I think I didn't ask him enough questions.

Kuehn: we have \$650K grant awarded, Curtis DID flood during that event, we haven't received help from any organizations, we're a small group. We paid \$10k to survey. As a small group we're trying to figure out how we can protect Hailey.

Wright: I was never in favor of this project in the first place because it had some shortcomings. I became interested when modeling was brought up, but I didn't ask all the questions I needed to.

McCaffrey: are you looking for money for modeling and match funds?

Kuehn: \$300K match.

Wright: I did not ask the second part of that question. I asked what will happen if waters go across highway. I should also ask what would be the extent of the flooding if the canal overflows.

Hovencamp: how can we resolve this project?

McCaffrey: was there any modeling done to determine initial project?

Kuehn: we dealt with effects of '17. We're just trying to figure out what can be done to stop that from happening again. Engineers looked at it then, and now we have new info. Inching along.

Hovencamp: do you have enough grant funding for the project right now?

Kuehn: we don't have the matching funds of \$350K. We're asking for \$10k for modeling.

Corwin: sounds like all you need to do is have engineer include model flows through canal headgate to highway 75. That would help answer Wright's question. They'll do inundation map. Then can go to second question of what to do if it does flood.

Wright: absolutely right.

Kuehn: that's a whole other thought. We're trying to make sure that doesn't happen again. Danger came from weakness in headgate.

Dean: can you ask your engineer to add what Corwin suggested?

K: Yes, and we'll absorb additional fees to address new language and 2 questions. J Phillips, does that work?

J Phillips: yes

Hovencamp: so you're asking for 10k to pay for modeling that'll include Wright's concerns?

Kuehn: yes, and we'll pay for additional cost

Dilworth: you were asking FCD9 to pay for entire amount 10K prior to making these changes?

Kuehn: we paid \$10K to have survey done.

Hovencamp moves to commit \$10K for modeling to Hiawatha Canal Company, that modeling will include Wright's concerns of potential overflow to Highway 75. Wright seconds. It passes unanimously.

PL566 Update – Cory McCaffrey and Amanda Bauman

McCaffrey: good segue. We've included Hiawatha in this, so potential to fund it.

About 20 projects on list. They've requested we pair it down or institute scoring mechanism to prioritize. Projects are from system's optimization review. Quite a few under fish passage and under habitat restoration. Wrapping up scoring on those.

Bauman: will be completed in next 2 hours.

McCaffrey: we've had 2 meetings with Jones & Demille, NRCS, Wright, Bauman, Corwin and myself. FCD9 is sponsor of this project. Another in week or two to gather any other info on which projects are possible. They have package of all data, documents, assessments, designs, etc. and they can start determining which projects are viable. Then go into Environmental Assessment where real engineering and design happen.

Dean: which ones is FCD9 involved in?

McCaffrey: Gimlet broader reach, Hiawatha, Broadford Levee, FMAA parcel

Dilworth: Bible Camp Levee could be a good one

McCaffrey: we need a WS4 letter from you. Shared with Wright – needs to be filled out.

Wright: leads to source of confusion on my part. Shoen, 3 board members need to see it, how do you do that between meetings with open meeting laws?

Shoen: you should have completed letter, then motion for chairman to approve letter.

Alternatively, call a special meeting and link in other 2

McCaffrey: you can distribute to other commissioners and then we can address any questions next meeting, we can delay til then. Big decisions, could be a lot of work for Linnet with funding, etc.

Wright: this line requires us to pay for all costs. I don't want to sign anything that will drain our bank account

McCaffrey: FCD9 will not be responsible for all funds

Amanda: maybe we need sub-contract

Corwin: there are always off ramps. You can say no after projects are defined. OK to sign now, not committing yourself to absolutely spend half a million dollars.

Shoen: I agree with Corwin. Each agency has its own rules – speak with the funding agency and get clarity around off ramps. Loop in NRCS rep who can answer those questions.

Corwin: those can be written into your contract/project

Shoen: NRCS office is out of Arco and they have very little staff and they move very slowly.

This isn't going to move at speed of light

McCaffrey: local NRCS contact is Daniel Murdoch. Based in Boise. Arco is not part of this project. EA process will likely involve local NRCS. You're the sponsor, not the owner of the projects. Owners are responsible for operations and maintenance. To Bauman's point, it would be good to have that in contract or MOU.

Shoen: NRCS has its own standards that will have to be met. Be prepared for that.

Hovencamp: we're not committed to anything now, just more understanding.

McCaffrey: most of the projects are completely covered by NRSC. They're hiring. Could lead to longer process times.

Shoen: NRCS planning and design may be more expensive than yours.

McCaffrey: will likely need to go through NEPA. There are strings attached, but free money is worth it.

Dilworth: we've always worked locally. Corps has reimbursed us a few times in the past, but it's always been cheaper to do locally.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

NEXT MEETING: Linnet has been told by Lovell at County that June 19th won't work, as the building is closed in observance of Juneteenth. She will inquire about Commissioner's Room availability for Wednesday, June 26th at 9:00AM.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: (none)

ADJOURN: Hovencamp moves to adjourn meeting. Wright seconds. Meeting is adjourned at 10:27AM.