

Agenda
King County Flood Control Zone District
4th Planning Team Meeting
Wednesday, November 18, 2009
1:00-3:00

Objectives

- Update on County Regional Plan
 - HAZUS update
 - Final Objectives
 - Outreach update
 - Action plan
-

Introductions		1:00 PM
Update on County Regional Plan	Rob Flaner	1:10 PM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Status report		
HAZUS Update	Ed Whitford Tetra Tech	1:20 PM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Second-Run HAZUS results-flood (100-year)• Earthquake results• Exposure data-other hazards• Dam Failure-what are we going to do about maps?		
Final Objectives	Rob Flaner	1:45 PM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review final objectives		
Outreach Update	Rob Flaner/ Saffa Bardaro	2:00 PM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Website• Public meetings• Press releases		
Action Plan	Rob Flaner	2:15 PM
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The action plan matrix• Flood projects-who wants to identify those?• Projects for other hazards• Alternatives review		
Action Items for Next Meeting	Rob Flaner	2:55 PM
Adjourn		3:00 PM

MEETING SUMMARY

Date of Meeting: November 18, 2009
Subject: 4th Planning Committee meeting
Project Name: KCFCD-LHMP
In Attendance: Jason Wilkinson, Ken Zweig, Katy Vanderpool, Sally King, Saffa Bardaro, Nancy Faegenburg
Planning Team - Rob Flaner, Ed Whitford, Laura Hendrix
Not Present:
Summary Prepared by: Laura Hendrix - November 18, 2009
Project No.: 135-12539-09001-05
Quorum- Yes or No N/A

Item	Action
------	--------

Welcome and Introductions

- Rob Flaner opened the meeting with brief group introductions.
- The previous meeting minutes were reviewed and approved with amendments.

Update on County Regional Plan

Rob provided the Committee a brief overview of what is going on with the King County Regional Plan update. The County Regional Plan expired on November 1, 2009; which could have had severe ramifications on pending King County grant applications from DR 1817-1825. The County's Executive's office assumed leadership of the plan update. The base plan is now a single jurisdiction plan, covering only the county. Each local government will be incorporated into a multi-jurisdictional plan during the second phase. King County completed the process and FEMA approved the plan November 16, 2009. All projects in que are now being considered for funding.

The Flood Control District will continue pursue its DMA eligibility under a stand alone, single jurisdictional plan. The District has agreed to share its data with the County to promote regional coordination between the plans. The two different plans will be maintained separately by their respective agencies.

HAZUS UPDATE

Ed Whitford provided an update of the HAZUS modeling for the plan. Second run results with updated Flood Control District critical facilities were provided to the committee. Differences between the 100-year and 500-year flood data were considered. Rob reminded the group that all County Critical facilities would be assessed for the flood hazard, and only District Critical facilities would be

Meeting Summary

Item	Action
addressed for the other hazards.	
Earthquake data and levee impacts were also discussed. EERI at UW provided accurate data for the Seattle fault (6.7 magnitude), however the data is only in hardcopy format. Therefore, the 7.2 magnitude Seattle Art Scenario from the USGS is being utilized in the model. In the Seattle Art Scenario about 90% of levees would be significantly impacted. The levee data indicates that D and E soils are not only soft floodplain soils but are also susceptible to liquefaction. Ken Zweig indicated that two types of levees need to be defined in the model, traditional levees and bank stabilization revetments. Rob asked if there was a reasonable estimate for extent of levee failure. Ken suggested that levee damage repair would cost about \$2000/lineal feet.	Ed to confirm that 500-year data is equal to or greater than 100-year data. Ken will contact geologist Terry Butler about performance standards (estimate for extent of failure) for levees and revetments Ed will review levee data to separate levees from bank revetments Ed will break up the landslide, earthquake, lahar, and wildfire data into watersheds. Ed will include King County's building with the facilities data.
With lahars the assumption must be made that levee damage would be extreme. Landslides could both overtop/bury levees and relocate them. These landslides are most likely located within the Cedar River Watershed.	
Ed is still waiting for additional critical facilities data which will be incorporated into the flood models. More accurate data on the lower and upper Snoqualmie may be available building by building (Sally will compare data with Ed.)	
There was some discussion about the bridge damage function in HAZUS. Nancy is concerned that not all critical facilities and access roads are included in the model. It was stressed that bridge data such as local surveyed elevations are not included as bridge data in HAZUS default. For time efficiency and reduced expenditures, the decision was to use default HAZUS data rather than create or import new data.	
Dam inundation models were also discussed. Ed has one shapefile for Culmback Dam and the Tolt Dam inundation shapefile is soon expected. Ken indicated that the USACE's Howard Hansen and Mud Mountain hard copy dam inundation maps are not to be used for public release. A suggestion was made to include some language within the plan indicating that there are four dams with significant downstream risk, however since the complete data is not available the inundation areas would not be included. Katy suggested that a best effort be made to document that the USACE was not responsive to requests for dam inundation information.	Rob will provide some draft language so that a USACE letter may be crafted.

Objectives Exercise

Rob went over the revised objectives list with the committee. The previous 19 statements were consolidated into 12 objectives. The Committee reviewed the statements and accepted the 12 objectives. Saffa requested that minor changes be made regarding punctuations and the title so that the goals/objectives may be posted to the website. The following statements are the 12 objectives of the plan :

1. Protect and maintain critical facilities, including levees and revetments, within the District.
2. Improve floodplain conveyance through modification or removal of flood facilities when appropriate.
3. Utilize best available data to identify the location and potential impacts of natural hazards on people, property and natural environment

Meeting Summary

Item	Action
4. Improve systems that provide warning and emergency communications	
5. Retrofit, purchase, or relocate structures in high hazard areas including those known to be repetitively damaged within the capabilities of the District.	
6. Coordinate District hazard mitigation efforts, including planning and projects, with other mitigation efforts within the planning area to leverage all potential partnerships.	
7. Inform the public on the risk exposure to natural hazards and ways to increase the public's capability to prepare, respond, recover and mitigate the impacts of these events.	
8. Increase resilience and the continuity of operations of identified critical facilities within the District.	
9. Support programs within the planning area that are recognized under the CRS program	
10. Seek mitigation projects that provide the highest degree of natural hazards protection at the least cost.	
11. Seek risk reduction projects that minimize or mitigate their impacts on the environment.	
12. Where feasible, support agricultural preservation within the context of sound floodplain management.	

Outreach Strategy

Saffa provided the committee an update on the Public Outreach strategy and a copy of the draft website page. Saffa is in the process of editing the website although it has not yet gone live. She would like to add more citizen friendly language and update the FAQ section.

Concern was expressed about what exactly the public would be commenting on at this stage of the process. Rob stated it is the map data that citizens are being asked to review or provide comment on. Rob suggested that Saffa change the website to offer these work products for review and then if the public has comments/questions to contact Priscilla.

Saffa would like the FAQ section to focus on the citizen benefits of involvement, specifically addressing why this plan is this important to each citizen (ie. helps determine needed projects, benefits your community, and makes grants available). The importance of avoiding overly technical jargon and legal requirements was discussed.

Saffa will revise the FAQ to focus on citizen benefits, then Rob will review and return to Saffa for any additional editing

Map review and public comment were discussed again. Saffa proposed the following questions to pose to the public:

“Are the flood hazards accurately depicted?”

Meeting Summary

Item	Action
<p>“Are the hazards you experience recognized in these maps?” {All hazards impact on just the district flood facilities not the individual homeowner}</p> <p>Katy asked if the pdf maps could be revised so that people could zoom in for a closer look. Saffa requested both jpegs and pdfs from Ed to post on the website. The benefits of small pdfs vs large posters were discussed. Rob stated that any public comments outside of the scope of the plan would be taken and although not considered in this plan, the information would be shared with other jurisdictions such as County Regional or incorporated cities working on plans.</p> <p>Saffa also questioned if the flood plan update should be mentioned within this project’s outreach. She is concerned that the public will be confused about this process and the flood plan update process. Links to the flood plan and regional plan should be included in the FAQ.</p>	<p>Ed will communicate with Saffa about the available maps and provide the requested language describing what is shown on the maps</p> <p>Rob will write an FAQ addressing “How does this plan differ from the flood plan and the regional plan?”</p> <p>Saffa will create a press release to notify citizens of the website once launched</p>

Action Plan

Rob introduced the Hazard Mitigation Action Plan Matrix. Projects that are eligible for funding may already be in the 5-year Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) should be included in the matrix. He noted that Public Assistance (PA) requests need to be in this plan. Rob suggested that these action plans be separated into basins. If costs are known, such as in the CIP, the cost should be listed.

Unknown costs should be identified as follows:

High = don’t know how to pay for this project

Medium = reallocation of existing funds

Low = project already targeted for funding or grant has been received

This process helps to identify the projects that are most beneficial. Both new and existing district facilities need to be targeted. Rob noted that there was a need to address an action for each hazard at least once within the matrix (earthquake, lahar, landslide).

Basin Leads will populate the matrix with projects by watershed

Rob will email the digital matrix to the committee

The Meeting was adjourned by Rob Flaner at 3:00PM

Please note, that all Planning Committee meetings are scheduled for the 3rd Wednesday of every month, unless otherwise notified.

The next meeting date is:

Wednesday, December 16, 2009, 2009 from 1:00 to 3:00 PM

Location to be announced.