

**Aaron Smith (USACE)**: Mr. Smith welcomed the attendee's and went through the purpose and agenda of the meeting. Mr. Smith explained that Jay Aya-ay had an emergency situation arise at the last minute and could unfortunately make-it.

**Rodney Cremeans (USACE)**: Mr. Cremeans gave an update on the power situation at the pump station and explained that it had been determined that the breaker for the pumps direct service line had tripped as the exterior transformer was not adequate for all three pumps and AEP was replacing the transformer at no cost to the tax payer.

**Rodney Cremeans (USACE)**: Passed out the current DSMR schedule and explained how it worked and highlighted certain milestones

**Aaron Smith (USACE)** Gave an update on the Vertical Team Meeting that occurred on 1 August 2011 and highlighted the two areas of significant discussion, W/O Project Condition and the potential National Historic Landmark (NHL) Status of the Community

Mr. Smith gave an overview of what W/O Project Condition is, and why the Corps forecasts what would happen to the project and village if no action was taken over the next 50 years. Mr. Smith explained that we were required to study no action under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) as well as by Corps guidance. Mr. Smith pointed out that we forecasted what was reasonable to assume would occur for a baseline to compare the effectiveness of a taking action and comparing action alternatives to taking no action. Mr. Smith pointed out the particular challenge that could be associated with a potential scenario where it is forecasted that the levee would require breaching or backfilling due to deteriorated performance in the future and that the Village would then likely have to be acquired.

Mr. Smith also explained that we had been directed to separate the potential NHL status of the community during our Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) consultation, as the Village had not been officially designated as an NHL. The District still plans to fully document the status of that analysis within its study, but cannot apply the standard Section 110f of the NHPA requires of federal agencies.

**George Kane (OHS)**: Stated that this made no sense and that OHS expected to here from the National Park Service in the near-term about the viability of conducting the study. Mr. Kane wondered if this potential go-ahead would be enough to apply the 110f standard.

**Aaron Smith (USACE)**: Explained that based on the guidance we had received from our headquarters that unless the Village is officially designated as a National Historic Landmark, we cannot apply that standard, although we would document the efforts being undertaken to seek that status in the report.

**Jami Buchanan (USACE):** Ms. Buchanan proceeded with follow-up discussion on last month's economic discussion. Specifically the following questions and follow-up was provided

**ORIGINAL QUESTION: Holly Thouvenin (Resident):** Can you count the loss of income from not being able to get work?

**ORIGINAL RESPONSE: Jami Buchanan (USACE):** Unsure, but will check into that question.

*FOLLOW UP: YES, BUT WE HAVE TO MAKE REASONABLE ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT INGRESS, EGRESS AND AVAILABILITY OF OTHER MODES OF TRANSPORTATION*

**ORIGINAL QUESTION: John Elsasser (ZCA):** Without the levee Rte 212 would be inundated more frequently and impact school closings more frequently. How is that accounted for total projects and benefits?

**ORIGINAL RESPONSE: Jami Buchanan (USACE):** Relocation costs would be counted – but will double check.

*FOLLOW UP: THE ONLY ACURED COST FROM RTE 212 WOULD BE IF THE ROAD NEEDED TO BE MOVED SPECIFICALLY TO FACILITATE SOME ALTERNATION TO THE LEVEE. THE COST OF RELOCATION OF THAT PORTION OF RTE 212 IMPACTED WOULD THEN BE INCLUDED IN THE COST ESTIMATE.*

**ORIGINAL QUESTION: Mayor Bell / George Kane (OHS):** How would the loss of wages from income in Zoar associated with working in Zoar – or loss of income from not being able to have festivals, or school tours be accounted for?

**ORIGINAL RESPONSE: Jami Buchanan (USACE):** Potentially these could be counted in the Economic Analysis, but need to check into that.

*FOLLOW-UP: ALL OF THESE COSTS WOULD BE SUMMARIZED FOR THE QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS, BUT NOT WHEN CALCULATING NET BENEFITS, BECAUSE IT IS ASSUMED THAT THIS INCOME WOULD BE TRANSFERRED ELSEWHERE IN THE NATION.*

**ORIGINAL QUESTION: Question:** Would the loss of ability to work virtually because of service interruptions associated the internet and phone services during flooding count as damages prevented?

**ORIGINAL RESPONSE Jami Buchanan (USACE):** I will have to follow-up on that question.

*FOLLOW-UP: NO, USACE GUIDANCE DOES NOT ALLOW US TO ACCOUNT FOR THIS AS AN ECONOMIC DAMAGE THAT COULD BE PREVENTED OR A BENEFIT, WHEN CALCULATING NET BENEFITS.*

**ORIGINAL QUESTION: John Elsasser (ZCA):** How does the economic analysis account for lost wages and taxes collected from a scenario where the community is acquired?

**ORIGINAL RESPONSE: Jami Buchanan (USACE):** I don't believe that is counted, but I will check into that.

*FOLLOW-UP: THE ECONOMIC ANALYSIS DOES NOT ACCOUNT FOR THESE THINGS DUE TO THE ASSUMPTION THAT THESE LOST BENEFITS WOULD BE TRANSFERRED INTO THE ECONOMY ELSEWHERE. WE ASSUME THAT LOST TAXES AND WAGES WILL BE COLLECTED IN OTHER AREAS, WHICH LEAD TO NO NET CHANGE IN THE NED.*

**Aaron Smith (USACE):** Suggested the next meeting take place on 15 September 2011 and this was agreed to by all parties.

**THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED**