GREEN RIVER SYSTEM-WIDE IMPROVEMENT FRAMEWORK
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting #1 Summary Notes

Executive Summary

TAC Recommendations and Action Items

The TAC considered three key issues:

- **Combined Advisory Council and Technical Advisory Committee draft Charter**.
  - TAC recommendation: add additional members to the Advisory Council to reflect state regulatory agencies and environmental organizations. The recommendation will be forwarded to the Flood Control District Executive Committee for consideration.
- **Green River SWIF geographic scope.**
  - TAC recommendation: The TAC concurred with the proposed geographic scope and recommended it be forwarded to the Advisory Council for consideration.
- **Green River SWIF vision and goals.**
  - TAC Action Item: The TAC will review the vision/goals document and provide feedback to Jennifer Knauer via email. The Green River SWIF project team will present a summary of comments received and the next version of the vision/goals document at the next TAC meeting.

TAC Business

The TAC will participate in a joint TAC/AC site tour in October and will meet again in November. The TAC will set a monthly placeholder for meetings with the expectation that meetings will not be held every month.

Presentations and updates

The TAC heard and discussed a presentation on the following topic area:

- Green River SWIF project and process overview

Public Comment

No public comment was provided.

Detailed Meeting Summary

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Organization/Entity	Member	Attendance
King County	Rick Bautista	Present
King County	Megan Smith	Present
US Army Corps of Engineers	Mark Ohlstrom	Present
Muckleshoot Indian Tribe	Holly Coccoli	Present
City of Tukwila	Bob Giberson	Present
City of Kent	Mike Mactutis	Present
City of Auburn	Dennis Dowdy	Present
City of Renton	Ron Straka	Present
National Marine Fisheries Service	Jody Walters	Present
Federal Emergency Management Agency	Ted Perkins	Present
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Stewart Reinbold	Present
Washington Department of Ecology	Josh Baldi	Present
Puget Sound Partnership	Bruce Wulkan	Present
Water Resource Inventory Area 9	Doug Osterman	Present
Boeing	Mike Bertsch	Present
NAIOP, Commercial Real Estate Development Association	Don Marcy	Present
Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties	Allison Butcher	Present
Washington Realtors – Commercial & Residential	David Elliott	Present
The Nature Conservancy	Bob Carey	Present
American Rivers	Michael Garrity	Present

OTHER ATTENDEES

Reagan Dunn, Chair of the King County Flood Control District Board

Jennifer Knauer, King County Water and Land Resources Division
Lorin Reinelt, King County Water and Land Resources Division
Tom Goff, Chief of Staff for Board Chair Dunn
Emiko Atherton, Chief Staff for Board Vice-Chair Patterson
Mandy Michelson, US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Nicole Addington, EnviroIssues

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

Supervisor Reagan Dunn, Chair of the King County Flood Control District (FCD) Board, welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the Green River System-Wide Improvement Framework (SWIF) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). He said the mission of the King County FCD is to protect homes and property while also protecting the environment. Supervisor Dunn said the program is run very efficiently; approximately 94% of the $40 million annual operating budget is spent directly on infrastructure projects in King County.

Supervisor Dunn then provided background information on the SWIF process. The Green River SWIF is one of 24 national SWIFs across the United States. The Green River may be the most complex SWIF because of the large industrial and economic assets surrounding the river and the historical floodplain. The Green River SWIF will take a holistic approach to solving a set of issues associated with the Green River. The Green River SWIF TAC represents some of the many constituents that are interested in the management of the Green River. These constituents share a common goal: to protect public safety. Secondary goals include protecting a healthy environment and the economy. The TAC will meet ten times, with the final meeting expected to occur in February 2015. There are many complex issues the TAC will be asked to consider and they will be tasked with reaching consensus on recommendations for inclusion in, what Supervisor Dunn hopes, will be the best SWIF in the nation that can act as a guide for other SWIFs to follow. Supervisor Dunn concluded his remarks by encouraging TAC members to contact him with any issues or concerns.

Penny Mabie, meeting facilitator, reviewed the meeting agenda and goals. The meeting will begin with an overview of the SWIF process by King County Water and Land Resources Division staff. The TAC will then be asked to review the draft charter and recommend changes. Next, the TAC will be asked to confirm the geographic scope and provide input on the vision/goals document. The meeting will end with an opportunity for public comment and a review of any follow up actions.

Penny asked SWIF members to introduce themselves and share what their desired outcome is from the process.

- Doug Osterman, Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 9, said he works with a staff of 17 elected officials that provide professional salmon recovery services to their jurisdictions. His goal for the SWIF is to identify a set of tangible and targeted prioritized projects that will meet the needs of Chinook salmon recovery, followed by steelhead trout recovery in the Green River.
- Bob Carey, The Nature Conservancy, introduced himself as Director of Strategic Partnerships. He would like to see progress and a planning process that leads to viable, buildable, and supportable projects that have multiple benefits.
- Dennis Dowdy, City of Auburn, said he would like to achieve a uniform level of protection in urban areas that is reliable and dependable without any gaps in the system. Uniform protection is vital in order for businesses to thrive.
- Bob Giberson, City of Tukwila, said he would like to see an outcome that represents a reasonable balance between habitat and flood protection.
- Ron Straka, City of Renton, would like an outcome that reaches consensus and is both financially and physically feasible. The SWIF-TAC should develop a prioritized list of projects that achieve the desired level of protection while integrating environmental elements, including water quality and habitat, and be recognized by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood plain management.
- Michael Garrity, State Conservation Director for American Rivers, said he is particularly concerned about the temperature and habitat problems in the Lower Green River. He would like plans that use more natural flood plain management, creating more room for the Green River and a more vegetated riparian area. He also would like more connection between communities and the Green River.
- Mike Bertsch, Boeing, said he is concerned about five things: 1) agreement of diverse stakeholders that will allow forward progress, 2) reasonable amount of flood protection that is affordable to the region, 3) reasonable quality of life so Boeing can attract and retain the best employees, 4) maintain transportation infrastructure and vital corridors, and 5) greater certainty around all things Green River so businesses and residents alike can make informed decisions on real property investments.
- Allison Butcher, Master Builders Association (MBA) of King and Snohomish Counties, said there are 3,000 members in the MBA. She is encouraged by the integrated approach of the SWIF and will be following the flood protection planning from the standpoint of the business community and also looking at enhancements to the

environment. She noted the importance of certainty and predictability for businesses and affordability of flood insurance. FEMA flood insurance is also an issue.

- Bruce Wulkan, Puget Sound Partnership (PSP), said PSP has six primary goals, two of which include public health and public well-being as part of their efforts to restore Puget Sound. Bruce noted that PSP uses performance-based accountability to ensure they meet ecosystem recovery targets. PSP would like to foster a path forward that will meet flood protection goals, improve Chinook salmon populations, respect tribal treaty rights, and improve water temperatures.
- David Elliott, Director of Washington Commercial Realtors, said he would like to be able to provide answers to the real estate and developer community. The Green River Valley is a major employment center; there are 120 million square feet of office space in the Green River Valley and 140,000 people work in the area. People are concerned about the uncertainties of whether to build or not, if the Green River will flood and whether flooding can be controlled. David added that the question of whether insurance will be available or not and at what cost is a major factor that affects businesses.
- Don Marcy, NAIOP Chair, said he represents all aspects of commercial/industrial development from architects, contractors, developers, etc. NAIOP would like to see a flood protection program developed that provides certainty and has the right level of protection for the Highway 167 corridor.
- Mike Mactutis, Engineering Manager for the City of Kent, said Kent is concerned about the levee issue and salmon habitat. He said many of the issues in the Green River Valley are being addressed separately and he would like to see more integration. He noted that the City of Kent has been working to get FEMA accreditation on some of the levees on the left bank and have seen a number of levee deficiencies throughout three years of study. A lot of effort and a lot of money was expended to study the levees In Kent and hopefully there were not big surprises that come out of this process.
- Ted Perkins, FEMA, said he is tasked with helping communities reduce hazards and improving community resilience to natural hazards. He is interested in having discussions to better understand the science, which will help to better understand the risk and lead to better decision-making.
- Josh Baldi, Regional Director for the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said water quality which is one of Ecology's areas of responsibility, is another important factor to consider. He noted that water temperature is a big driver. Josh said he would like the outcome of this effort to be a design for a multiple-benefit project framework that includes a plan for how to identify projects and make them a reality.

- Mark Ohlstrom, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), said USACE is responsible for the operation of Howard Hanson Dam on the Green River, which is important for flood control. After a previous flood, the dam was repaired with a design capacity that will withstand a 150-year storm. A storm beyond that design threshold would overwhelm the system. USACE works with local agencies on flood risk and ecosystem management projects. Mark said he is a part of the TAC to list, participate, and be part of the solution.
- Stewart Reinbold, Assistant Project Manager for Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) Region 4, said his goal for the TAC is to come up with a framework that will protect cities and that safety is very important. He added that considerations of flood capacity also involve fisheries and other goals. Fish and game is a multi-million dollar industry in the State of Washington; the citizens of the state would like to ensure that existing populations are maintained into the future.
- Jody Walters, Fish Biologist for NOAA Fisheries, said NOAA's goals through the SWIF process is primarily safety as well as following the Chinook Salmon Recovery Plan for the Green River, and addressing limited floodplain connectivity.
- Rick Bautista, acting Executive Director of the King County FCD, said the district was created with the knowledge that flooding within the Green River Valley would be economically and socially devastating. Protection of the economic situation has been the primary goal since the King County FCD was established and salmon recovery has become a secondary consideration. Rick would like the SWIF to develop recommendations on an appropriate level of service based on land use to protect and develop efficient designs to advance LOP.
- Megan Smith, King County, said she represents a confluence of interests including economic development, transportation development, flood protection, salmon recovery, and recreation. She hopes the outcome of the TAC will be a common understanding of the risks faced by those living in the Green River valley and an agreed-upon level of protection. Regulatory requirements and investments should be aligned towards projects that can provide joint benefits. We need a road map moving forward.
- Holly Coccoli, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, said her vision for the SWIF-TAC is to develop a locally defined plan that addresses uncertainty, as well as flood risk reduction for businesses. She stressed the issue of high temperatures in the Green River, which are out of compliance to state standards and lead to major concerns about the future of salmon. Riverbank vegetation is not suitable in the Lower Green and conditions are also not healthy or suitable for salmon habitat. All projects should contribute to meeting the temperature standard.

GREEN RIVER SWIF OVERVIEW

Presentation

Jennifer Knauer and Lorin Reinelt, King County Water and Land Resources Division, presented an overview of the Green River SWIF. The purpose of the presentation was to build a common understanding of what the Green River SWIF is and why it is needed. They reviewed the roles and responsibilities of the TAC as well as the Advisory Council (AC) and FCD.

Comments

- Mike Mactutis said a levee breach was identified in 1959 but there is no evidence of anything occurring in 1965. Floods were a result of a backup at the Green River flood station.
    - Lorin responded that the presentation includes an initial compilation of flood events and will be further refined as work continues. The presentation was meant to illustrate that there are differences in levels of flood protection. The information is evolving and can be updated.

CHARTER

Penny reviewed the draft charter that will be applicable to both the TAC and the AC. She highlighted some of the important points, noting that it will be important for the group to agree to the process and operating guidelines. The draft charter represents standards that generally work well and can be changed to meet the needs of the TAC/AC. The draft charter will next go to the AC with any revisions. The charter includes specifics on the roles played by the AC and TAC, the option for alternates to attend in place of members, responsibilities of the TAC, the role of the facilitator, the consensus process, means of communication, frequency and schedule of meetings, and ground rules.

- Penny will send a survey to determine a monthly placeholder date and time for TAC meetings. The location will be the same.
- Jennifer noted she will serve as the point of contact for the SWIF and others may be available, depending on need.
- A contact sheet was circulated, TAC members were asked to fill in any missing information. The committee agreed that contacts will be shared with other TAC members, but not with the public.

Comments

- Doug Osterman said during the presentation, the role of WRIA 9 as the technical and habitat consultant was explained very well but that role is not described in the Charter.
    - Penny will add a point describing the role of WRIA 9.
- Several TAC members expressed concern that the AC membership does not have equal representation from state regulators or environmental interests. There were also concerns about the dynamic between the TAC and AC. Some members questioned whether the AC would be able to ignore or revise recommendations from the TAC. TAC members were concerned that their recommendations could be disregarded by a group that may not fully represent its interests and organizations.
    - Jennifer said two or three TAC meetings are anticipated for every one AC meeting. The AC will receive a package of information that will have been distilled down from the more technical discussions of the TAC. The AC was designed to be smaller and more intimate than the AC. There are representatives on the AC who can speak to environmental concerns. Jennifer said the TAC will make policy recommendations that are completed by technical work.
- Stewart Reinbold said he is concerned that the TAC represents a good group with varied interests but the AC is a little more confined. While business is important, the state regulatory community is also important because of the need for permits to do the work. If technical people are not involved in the AC discussions, the result will be less inclusive.
    - Penny said her understanding is that the AC would be adding to recommendations from the TAC, including putting in any policy perspectives. She suggested defining a loop-back mechanism between the AC and TAC.
    - Jennifer said there could be two potential solutions: to expand membership of the AC and to better define information flow between the AC and TAC coupled with some potential joint sessions.
- David Elliott asked if there are plans to have the AC and TAC meet jointly from time to time. While part of another TAC, he was able to meet once a year with the two other groups that were doing similar work.
- Dennis Dowdy requested that the TAC make a formal recommendation to add seats to the AC that would include state regulator agencies and other environmental groups. He said additional members could also lead to a more collaborative product.
- Bruce Wulkan noted that the PSP is the only state agency on the AC and they are not regulatory. Adding a regulatory entity to the AC could enhance their efforts.
- Rick Bautista said the Charter was reviewed by the Executive Committee with the understanding that there would be some potential changes. Adding members to the AC would be a fairly significant change. The Executive Committee put a lot of effort into determining the makeup of the AC and TAC so they would need to approve any

suggested changes to the groups. The final decision would be with the Executive Committee.
    - Josh Baldi asked if the Executive Committee had specifically discussed environmental representation of the AC or representation of state regulator agencies
    - Rick responded that he did not recall specific conversations about environmental groups on the AC.
- David Elliott said he would have to be convinced to change the recommended group makeup. It is early in the process and he does not believe more people are needed and he is seeking balance. He feels the business community would be underrepresented with additional environmental seats; the currently proposed AC would provide excellent representation for all interests.
    - Dennis noted that the Mayors on the AC and other entities such as the Muckleshoot Tribe are also interested in economic development so the business community is more widely represented on the AC.
- Megan Smith said the TAC could recommend reviewing the AC membership to ensure that everyone who is essential to moving projects forward, from both a policy and funding standpoint, has a voice on the AC and TAC.

The group decided to recommend the addition of an environmental interest and the two state regulatory groups to the AC for a total of three additional seats. The language of the Charter will be revised to include a statement about the technical advisory role of WRIA 9 and to better define a feed-back mechanism between the AC and TAC. The group will have another opportunity to review the Charter during the next meeting.

CONFIRM GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE; PROVIDE INPUT ON VISION/GOALS DOCUMENT

Geographic Scope

Jennifer reviewed the proposed geographic scope for the SWIF. The project area will begin at approximately River Mile 5.5 in the Lower Green River and extend upstream to Howard Hanson Dam. The Lower Green River will be the focal area with less consideration of the Middle and Upper Green River stretches. She stressed the importance of taking a system approach from rainfall through how water moves through the system.

Comments

- Stewart asked if fish passage at Howard Hanson Dam will be a part of the evaluation.

- Jennifer said fish passage might be incorporated as it relates to capacity and downstream flood protection but will not in itself be a point of discussion.

The group agreed to the scope as proposed.

Vision/Goals/Strategy

Penny asked the group to review the Vision/Goals/Strategy document and provide input via email prior to the next meeting. The group was asked to comment using tracked changes, with particular attention to anything that is a fatal flaw. Jennifer noted that the vision is lofty and aspirational. All of the primary goals and subordinate goals are based off of the vision statement. She added that the vision has gone through the Executive Committee and the next iteration of the document will be presented to the AC.

ACTION ITEMS

- A doodle poll will be sent with some options for a placeholder meeting date
- Jennifer will start to organize a possible tour of the Green River for the TAC and AC.
- The Charter will be revised for discussion at the next TAC meeting
- King County FCD and Executive staff will bring the TAC recommendation to expand the AC forward for Executive Committee consideration
- Jennifer will email the draft SWIF Vision/Goals document to TAC members for their review and editing. Proposed edits will be considered by King County FCD and the next generation of the Vision/Goals document will be brought to the next TAC meeting for consideration