Cedar River Corridor Plan Advisory Committee

Renton Public Library, Highlands Branch
2902 NE 12th St, Renton
24 February, 2015
1:00-4:00 PM

Food/snacks and meeting materials will be provided
Please be sure to bring your calendars!

Meeting Purpose: Clarify purpose of this committee and expectations. Begin to create shared understanding of the Physical processes of the basin and the way people are using it.

1:00 – 1:40	**1. Welcome, Introductions**	
	a. Welcome and Introductions b. Overview agenda	Steve Bleifuhs Tamie Kellogg
1:40 – 2:10	**2. Corridor Plan Background, Purpose, and Your Role**	
	a. Purpose of the King County corridor plans b. Background of this planning effort and Cedar River Corridor Planning Steps (5-10 min.) c. Advisory Committee Charter i. Your roles and responsibilities.	Katy Vanderpool Nancy Faegenburg Tamie Kellogg
2:10 – 2:25	**Break**	
2:25-2:45	**Basin Orientation**	Nancy Faegenberg
	a. Adopted Plans b. History of Floodplain management generally and in the Cedar River c. Overview of the significant projects and programmatic work of the Flood District d. Questions and Comments	
2:45 –3:30	**Overview of River Channel Floodplain & Human Uses**	Mark Ewbank
	a. Presentation on Physical Characteristics of the Basin i. Questions and Answers b. Presentation and Discussion on Human Uses i. Advisory Committee discussion and input.	

3:30 – 3:55	**Next Steps with Public Engagement, Logistics, and Next Steps**	Tamie Kellogg
	a. Logistics: a. Our Meetings i. Schedule and location for Advisory Committee meetings. ii. The following are options for our next meeting Bring your calendar for scheduling. Monday March 23, 2-7:00 PM. Thursday March 26, 2 -7:00 PM or Friday March 27, 9:00-1:00. Extended meeting time for additional "current conditions" information to be shared. b. Your participation: a. Alternates b. Guiding principles c. Communications i. One Hub c. Outreach Plan/Public Engagement: a. Public Workshop in May, 2015 i. Solicit input on the meeting.	
3:55 – 4:00	**Public Comment**	Tamie Kellogg
	a. Opportunity for members of the public to share their thoughts or ask questions about the Cedar River Corridor Plan.	

Cedar River Corridor Plan Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary
February 24, 2015

Meeting Attendees

Committee Members

Organization/Entity	Member	Attendance
River Safety Council	Martha Parker	Present
Master Builders Association	Joe Herr	Present
Cedar River Council	Jeff Nuener	Present
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Larry Fisher	Present & Represented by Christa Heller
City of Seattle	Cyndy Holtz	Present
WRIA8	John Stokes	Represented by Jason Mukvihill-Kuntz
National Park Service	Alex Stone	Present
Cedar River Residential Property Owner	Jerry Bronson	Present
Renton Chamber of Commerce	Vicky Baxter	Present
Forterra	Judy Blanco	Present
Cedar River Residential Property Owner	Marilyn Whitley	Present
Greater Maple Valley UAC / Community Service Area	Steve Hiester	Present
City of Renton	Ron Straka	Present
Boeing	Mike Bertsch	Present
NOAA	Tom Sibley	Absent
American Whitewater	Tom O'Keefe	Absent
(King County) Community Service Areas Program	Alan Painter	Absent

Other Attendees

Mark Hoppen, Executive Director of the Flood Control District
Kathy Minsch, alternate for City of Seattle
Tom Allyn, alternate for Cedar River Council
Christa Heller, alternate for WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Nathan Brown, Cedar River Council
Michelle Manza, Forterra
Mike Grijalva, Citizen
Lawrence Reymann, Citizen
John Kernkamp, Citizen
Suzy Slining, Citizen

King County DNRP, Water and Land Resource Division Staff
Steve Bleifuhs, River and Floodplain Management Section Manager
Monica Walker, Cedar River Corridor Plan Public Outreach Coordinator
Nancy Faegenburg, Cedar River Corridor Plan Project Manager
Katy Vanderpool, River and Floodplain Management Section, Countywide Policy and Planning
Kate Akyuz, Cedar River Corridor Plan Senior Ecologist
Craig Garric, Cedar River Corridor Senior Engineer
(Not Present) John Engel, Cedar River Supervising Engineer

Herrera Consulting Team
Tamie Kellogg, Facilitator, Kellogg Consulting
Natasha Walker, Project Assistant & Meeting Summary, Kellogg Consulting
Mark Ewbank, Project Manager, Herrera Environmental Consultants

Meeting Overview

At this meeting the Cedar River Corridor Plan Advisory Committee:

- Were introduced to one another and the project team, and were given the opportunity to provide feedback on Committee expectations and ground rules. No comments were received.
- Explored the relationship between the King County Flood Control District, the King County Council, and the Cedar River Corridor Plan.
- Received a brief historical perspective on King County floodplain management and a brief chronological synopsis of significant Flood Control District projects and programmatic work, and events relative to the Cedar River Basin. This was provided in order to help committee members get a clear understanding of the need for this plan.
- Received the Draft Cedar River Corridor Plan draft goals and objectives and timeline. Committee members were asked to review them in advance of the March Advisory Committee meeting so they would be prepared to discuss them.
- Heard from the Herrera Consulting team on physical conditions, habitat conditions and human use statistics within the Corridor. These conclusions will be summarized in an existing conditions report, likely ready by one of our next two Committee meetings.
- Worked in small groups to identify and discuss human use interests in the Corridor.
- The following materials were distributed: Meeting Agenda, Advisory Committee charter, Advisory Committee Ground Rules, Advisory Committee Involvement Process Timeline, Working Draft Goals and Objectives for the Corridor Plan, Corridor Planning process graphic, Foundational Plans document, Basin Overview timeline graphic, Basin Fact Sheet

Action Items

- By the next meeting, the advisory committee should have reviewed and be ready to provide input on the goals and objectives and advisory committee ground rules.
- At the next meeting, contact information for all advisory committee members will be provided via e-mail or posted in advance.
- Martha Parker has requested the County provide a formal statement regarding what the studies say regarding whether the dam is passing gravel during a flood.

- Jeff Neuner has requested mapping layers that show county facilities. Upon the completion of county review, Herrera will also provide mapping layers displaying private facilities, mapped during their recent float of the Cedar River.
- Alex Stone, National Parks Service encouraged those members interested in serving in a smaller work group to help prepare for a recreation workshop in May to contact her.
- If Advisory Committee members and/or King County are interested in information related to a particular agency / user group or data / special info request, there was a request to let the project team know well in advance of a meeting in order to allow time for preparation.
- Add the Neighborhood supervisor list for the City of Renton to public outreach contacts list.

Public Comment

- Lawrence Reymann provided a document regarding input from meeting with the City of Renton and biologists about habitat restoration and Chinook production.

Welcome & Introductions

Steve Bleifuhs welcomed the Advisory Committee members and expressed appreciation for their involvement in the Cedar River Corridor Plan. He provided a brief overview of the committee selection process and the relationship between the King County Flood Control District (the owners and decision-makers of the Corridor Plans) the King County Water and Land Resource Division, (the service provider for the Flood Control District) and the Cedar River Corridor Planning process.

Facilitator Tamie Kellogg introduced herself, the project team, and led the committee and attendees through introductions. She then reviewed the meeting agenda and materials provided to advisory committee members.

Corridor Plan Background, Purpose and Members Role

Katy Vanderpool, River and Floodplain Management Section, Countywide Policy and Planning

In order to provide context for the Cedar River Corridor Plan, Katy provided an overview of strategic planning within the River and Floodplain Management Section of King County

Katy described an historic "Rivers" organization that leveraged funding to get work done as opportunities arose. She explained that the establishment of the King County Flood Control District increased the capacity for completing flood risk reduction work. This significant organizational shift made clear the need to better articulate long term visions for river corridors, how all riverine projects would work together and what overall changes may come. A strategic planning effort was needed to integrate a multitude of floodplain objectives within identified priority areas.

Staff developed the River and Corridor Planning Framework which is:

- Geographically specific, focusing on areas where flood risks are significant and best addressed in an integrative way.
- Scalable, considering unique partners and solutions within the identified planning area.
- Consistent and iterative, where stakeholder and public input is gathered and coupled with technical analysis.
- A decision-making process for the Flood Control District with multiple benefits.

River corridor plans will thoughtfully consider outcomes and identified risks, mitigate planning actions at a cumulative scale, and establish prioritized capital and programmatic actions, resulting in a 50+ year vision and 20 year investment strategy.

River corridor plans will all be amended to the King County Flood Hazard Management Plan, which serves several regulatory compliance roles at the local, state and federal level.

Nancy Faegenburg, Project Manager
Project Manager Nancy Faegenburg opened with the Cedar River Corridor Plan project team mission. She then provided a brief overview of the Draft Goals and Objectives, which will be reviewed and discussed at the second Advisory Committee Meeting. She followed it with a review of the purpose, history, resources and key planning steps and timeline for the Cedar River Corridor Plan. This included a brief overview of the existing plans / studies utilized to describe the existing conditions in the Cedar River Corridor and identify the issues/challenges.

The next step in the process, she explained, is to prioritize these issues/challenges and a range of possible solutions action alternatives. She reminded Advisory Committee members that this was a multi-objective planning effort. Though some actions proposed in the end may be oriented more towards one interest, she expressed hope that many would be synchronized with other interests and remain consistent with the policies and guiding principles of the existing foundational plans. Other important notes about this planning effort included:

- That the project team is not working from scratch; i.e. they are utilizing existing plans and data to mine existing conditions information and guidelines for solutions/action alternatives.
- That they are not working in a vacuum; i.e. they are involving partners such as City of Renton, WRIA8, Muckleshoot to provide input on the data and process.
- That the plan includes heavy public involvement efforts along the way.

Tamie Kellogg, Facilitator
Reviewed the Advisory Committee charter, beginning with a draft timeline, Advisory Committee purpose, members' responsibilities, meeting ground rules, and the project team's hopes for committee success. She briefly introduced OneHub, where committee members will be able to access meeting materials. She encouraged members to reach out to Kellogg Consulting or project staff should they have any questions about their participation or the planning effort overall.

<u>Questions, Comments, Reactions</u>

- Committee Member: I assume alternates will also get invitation to OneHub?

- Tamie Kellogg: Yes

Basin Orientation

In order to help contextualize the current conditions of the Cedar River and help provide a baseline for understanding the Cedar River Corridor Planning process, Project Manager Nancy Faegenburg gave an in-depth history of floodplain management both in King County and specifically within the Cedar River basin. Utilizing a graphic charting the historical events on the Cedar River, Nancy reviewed significant projects, regulatory and legal changes, and programmatic work of the Flood Control District on the Cedar River channel.

Questions, Comments, Reactions

- Committee Member: Most of the flow comes from below masonry dam. So in addition to all of the factors Nancy described, we (Seattle Public Utility) have no control over what comes in the river below the dam.
- Citizen: Wasn't there a big flood event in 09? I remember every one of the WDFW saying there was more than a 90% mortality of the juveniles in the riverbed because of the '09 flood. I know when I look at the LWD, at the bridge in downtown Renton and going down to look at it and thinking I'll look at it from the shore rather than standing on the boat and it seemed to be big.
    - Nancy Faegenburg: yes, 2009 was one of the biggest floods on record. 1990 and 1975 were really big as well.

Overview of River Channel Floodplain & Human Use Conditions

Project Manager Mark Ewbank with the Herrera Consulting team provided a very high level overview of the conditions within the corridor. These included:

- Existing physical conditions, such as geomorphology, channel migration and bank erosion;
- Habitat conditions, such as bank armoring effects and basic characteristics related to wood density and riparian tree cover and general refuge habitat for juvenile salmon;
- Human use statistics, such as infrastructure, businesses, recreational areas and population demographics.

Mark also took a moment to review geographic terminology and geographic segmentation maps, which may prove to be helpful as the Advisory Committee begins to review subsequent, more technical documentation. Mark explained that the project team is currently wrapping up a draft report of the existing conditions, which will be available for Advisory Committee members to read in the coming months.

Questions, Comments, Reactions

- Committee Member: You mentioned the privately-owned revetments; are they ones landowners have put in on their own?
    - Mark Ewbank: Yes. Or at least the County doesn't know who did. The presumption is the landowner at some point built or organized it. Some of these are concrete blocks, rock and construction debris and tend to be unknown origin and unsure what

they're made of. We did our best in a slow float trip with a lot of photos to catalog what they're made of.

- Committee Member: That's no longer allowed for a private landowner to do that along the river?
    - Craig Garric: Shoreline permits can still be had. There would be a review process
    - Mark Ewbank: It's getting more and more difficult to get a permit to do it. It's allowable, but chances are some mitigation would need to be done to go with it.
- Committee Member: I'm curious about land armoring. It looks so different than other states. Appears to be less invasive. They just pile it in spots.
    - Mark Ewbank: I can show you a ton of photos of various types, including where it goes for broader lengths. But where its private property, that would have been expensive rock and maybe they were grading out the foundation of the house and thought to use the rocks and pack them up on the bank.
- Committee Member: And where's the tributary? Out of a glacier?
    - Mark: There's a lot of tributaries that come into the river. But it starts at the Cascade Crest. A lot of smaller creeks feed in.
- Committee Member: Is there a way to find out which revetments are county facilities? Is it in one of the documents?
    - Mark Ewbank: Craig has the Flood Control book. Can we share that mapping?
    - Craig Garric: I don't see a problem with that at all. We can map with our facility layer on it.
    - Mark Ewbank: We have GIS data on the private facilities too. That map product is undergoing county review, but we could marry that up with the county facilities map.
    - Craig Garric: I do want to channel my colleagues that manage that stuff and their knowledge. There's some updating that needs to be done with the facilities layer but with the caveat that it's not completely accurate, it gives you a general sense.
- Nathan Brown, King County Staff : If you wanted to do a jump start on learning about the Draft Channel Migration plan, Terry Butler will be presenting on it tonight at the Cedar River Council meeting. That's at 7PM at The Clubhouse at Riverbend Mobile Home Park.

Advisory Committee members then worked in small groups to pinpoint areas of human use interest within the Cedar River Corridor Plan reaches. By using a map of the Cedar River Corridor, committee members were able to provide specific points and insights into the types of activities occurring in this area. This input will help supplement information gleaned by the planning team on the existing human uses and areas of concern. Committee members were asked to identify:

- Areas of concern to you
- Significant ways that people are using/interacting within the Corridor
- Types of human uses we may not know about or haven't discussed

Break-Out Session Report-Outs

Group 1: Cyndy Holtz, Christa Heller, Jeff Neuner, Joe Herr, Martha Parker
Top topics included: habitat restoration, safety (fishing/swimming/tubing), Juvenile survival specifically Chinook and impacts on broader ecosystem, county management large woody debris and concerns that it would add hazard but better habitat protection. Flood control.

1. Agencies will add gravel to the river on the mistaken assumption that the dam can't pass gravel. Not true! Once level is well over 2000 cfs, the dam does pass gravel.
2. Boater/Floater safety between Landsburg and Hwy 18.
3. There will be so much wood added to the river, that it will all be closed to water recreation, due to wood danger
4. Invasive plant removal
5. Environmental education opportunities along Cedar River especially when salmon are present.
6. River paddlers want more and easier access to the river.
7. Some county LWD designs will fail, causing damage to public or private structures.
8. Areas of concern: finding agreeable solutions for all user groups in order to have a sustainable environment for habitat, business, recreation, residents, fish and wildlife.
9. Most Important:
    a. structures/infrastructure within floodplain
    b. fish and wildlife habitat protection/restoration throughout the study area
10. Once the county owns 80% of the river shore, there will be much pressure on remaining land owners to sell.
11. Public land needs active management to avoid nuisance uses.
12. Swimming and Fishing are important.
13. Need long-term programmatic funding source for invasive plant control and establishment of native vegetation n the riparian zone (on private property too).
14. King County River management practices should complement City of Seattle's investments to restore habitat in the Cedar River Watershed.
15. Identify opportunities for reconnecting floodplain to mainstem of river.
16. Need mechanisms to encourage private riverfront landowners to accept native planning along their banks.
17. When you dredge river miles 1 & 2, where does that material go? Removed from ecosystem?
18. Juvenile Chinook survival – habitat restoration. Creation side channels, "alcoves near mouth."
19. Assess impact of chinook production on orca survival in Salish Sea.
20. Set an economic value to recreational fisheries

Group 2: Jason Mukvihill-Kuntz (alt for John Stokes), Alex Stone, Jerry Bronson, Vicky Baxter, Judy Blanco
Top topics included: Talked a lot of about future development plans and what pressures it puts on the river (upstream/downstream), infill in lower segments, rec and impacts of levee improvement projects or repairs that create hazards for boaters/floaters, water quality, need for broader, more floodplain habitat. More recreational safety.

1) Rec Safety - primary concern in King County
2) Health of the River – water quality.

3) Riverfront landowners interest
4) Lack of floodplain and off-channel habitat for salmon
5) Future development in Renton and Maple Valley
6) Development:
    a. Pressure on roads and increased traffic
    b. Increases in impervious surfaces
    c. Deforestation
7) Designs for river treatments that pose increased hazards for recreation users.
8) Habitat restoration, knotweed control
9) Public Access
10) Public engagement and awareness opportunity
11) Challenge to fulfill commitment to social/environmental justice (including public engagement).
12) River walk, additional development
13) Population Growth, tourism
14) Crowding in existing parks (insufficient parking, etc. space for boats).

Group 3: Mike Bertsch, Ron Straka, Marilyn Whitley, Steve Hiester
Top topics included: Recreation in terms of river access, maintaining trails/parks, recreation opportunities, Flood protection especially in urban area, downtown/further up in Renton (property, jobs, economy).
1) Concern: Trees after cottonwoods die and fall in
2) Concern: Flood warning
3) Concern: River access for recreation (safety)
4) Concern: Alcohol and drug use by river users
5) Concern: Landslides
6) Use: Trails
7) Agricultural uses/resilient communities
8) Recreational uses – trail/parks/floaters
9) Area: Renton/Urban Area
    a. Concern: flood protection to property, businesses, employment area and infrastructure.

Next Steps with Advisory Committee and Public Engagement

Tamie reviewed the agenda for the March meeting. She solicited input for future other topics the advisory committee is interested in learning more about. No comments were received, but committee members were encouraged to email further suggestions.

The committee voted on a date and time for the next advisory committee, landing on Monday, March 23rd 2-6PM. Alternative dates/times and possibly location rotations will be used to accommodate the various advisory committee member preferences for day time and evening meetings and to encourage the chance of more public participation.

Advisory Committee agreed that providing a half an hour before the advisory committee meeting begins for the public to have questions answered and provide input into the process would be a

good idea to try. King County will have at a minimum one staff member available to meet with members of the public during this timeframe.

Lastly, Tamie provided a brief overview of the plan for public engagement. Currently, May 5th is being held for the next Public Meeting and will likely be immediately preceded by a workshop on recreation. Alex Stone of the National Parks Service encouraged Advisory Committee members interested in serving in a small work group to help prepare for that workshop to contact her.

Questions, Comments, Reactions

- Christa Heller asked that if there are any agenda items targeting a particular agency / user group or data requests or special info requests, of advisory committee members that King County lets them know ahead of time so they can come prepared. This allows those committee members to get additional information in areas they do not specialize in.
- Vicky Baxter suggested that Monica add the Neighborhood supervisor list for the City of Renton to outreach efforts. This includes over 70 contacts in Renton, she said.
- Martha Parker brought up a gravel study, which she said showed that Masonry dam passes gravel during a flood. She asked for an official statement from the county or whomever did the gravel study stating this, as she felt there were misconceptions regarding whether the dam holds back all of the gravel.