

**Agenda**  
**King County Flood Control Zone District**  
**5th Planning Team Meeting**  
Wednesday, December 16, 2009  
1:00-3:00

---

*Objectives*

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

<b>Introductions</b>		<b>1:00 PM</b>
• Review/approve minutes		
<b>HAZUS Update</b>	<b>Ed Whitford/Rob Flaner</b> Tetra Tech	<b>1:10 PM</b>
• Where are we at?		
• Review proposed Dam Failure Information Request letter		
<b>Outreach Update</b>	<b>Rob Flaner/ Saffa Bardaro</b>	<b>1:30 PM</b>
• Website		
• Public meetings		
• Press releases		
<b>Action Plan</b>	<b>Rob Flaner</b>	<b>1:45 PM</b>
• Review projects by basin		
• Do we have at least 1 initiative for each Hazard of Concern?		
• Prioritization-how?		
<b>Action Items for Next Meeting</b>	<b>Rob Flaner</b>	<b>2:55 PM</b>
<b>Adjourn</b>		<b>3:00 PM</b>

# MEETING SUMMARY

---

**Date of Meeting:** December 16, 2009  
**Subject:** 5th Planning Committee meeting  
**Project Name:** KCFCD-LHMP  
**In Attendance:** Jason Wilkinson, Ken Zweig, Priscilla Kaufmann,  
Sally King, Nancy Faegenburg, Brian Murray, Katy Vanderpool  
**Planning Team** - Rob Flaner, Laura Hendrix  
**Not Present:** Saffa Bardaro, Ed Whitford  
**Summary Prepared by:** Laura Hendrix – December 16, 2009  
**Project No.:** 135-12539-09001-05  
**Quorum- Yes or No** N/A

---

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

## Welcome and Introductions

- Rob Flaner opened the meeting with a brief summary of the previous meeting.
- The previous meeting minutes were reviewed and approved.

## HAZUS Update

Rob provided an overview of the recent changes to the HAZUS models. The 100-year floodplain deficiency was corrected by Ed Whitford since the census blocks had skewed the data overstating the floodplain area. The 500-year floodplain did not change.

The earthquake analysis for critical facilities within the district was discussed. It was made clear that only the district's owned facilities were included in the analysis (including the King County Building). Rob explained that the functional down-time (meaning loss of use) was considered rather than how much it would cost to repair or rebuild the damaged facility. Rob explained that the district's structures (pump plants), hold up better in an earthquake than a masonry type building.

The committee discussed including King County's DDES building as a critical facility since records are held there and they authorize permits and repair facilities. Sally King was concerned that including multiple agencies, departments and their facilities would convolute the study. Ken Zweig brought up the concept that it's the DDES staff that provides the service, not the facility. Rob reminded the group that stored documents are critical from a records standpoint. Nancy also brought up the written easements located in the King County Building and pointed out that only three facilities were currently included in the analysis.

Rob will ask Ed to include the King County Government building stock as critical facilities in the next analysis to address these concerns.

Levees and revetments were discussed and it was noted that replacement cost was

---

# Meeting Summary

Item	Action
<p>calculated at \$2000/per lineal foot. Due to soft, liquifiable soils, Rob indicated that in the worst case earthquake scenario, this data suggests that the levees and revetments will fail. (Vulnerability is based on an assumption with soft soils intersecting with the liquefaction hazard. The group requested that this be clearly located on the final documents.)</p>	
<p>The economic impact of the facilities was also considered. Rob pointed out that the economic impact is only loss of use of facilities, not loss of business and its impact on the economy. Nancy expressed concern that an earthquake resulting in a levee failure and ultimately a flood was not combined.</p>	
<p>As requested at the last meeting, Ed separated the HAZUS results for each hazard into watersheds. Rob pointed out that wildfire shows only exposure and there are no anticipated damages to levees or revetments. Landslides and lahars within watersheds were discussed. Rob indicated that the landslide data used in the analysis includes data from both King County and DNR.</p>	<p>Ed to confirm that there is no landslide data available for the Skykomish Watershed</p>
<p>Rob drafted a dam failure information request letter in effort to acquire dam failure data for Mud Mountain and Howard Hansen from the US Army Corps of Engineers. Katy Vanderpool requested an electronic copy of the draft letter.</p>	<p>Brian will check on lahar data from Mt. Rainier for impacts to the lower Green River</p>
<p>The Tolt Dam shapefiles are expected to be received next week. The Tolt Dam inundation area impacts will be analyzed in HAZUS. Several other dams and their available data were discussed. Rob indicated that including these dam inundation sets may delay the process. The committee doesn't want these dams to delay the public process, but would like the request letters documented so they could include the dams in the mitigation plan at a later date.</p>	<p>Rob will email draft dam failure info request letter to Katy</p>
<p><b><u>Outreach Update</u></b></p>	<p>Rob will check with the City of Seattle to see if Masonry Dam and Landsberg Dam along the Cedar River are high hazard to determine if they should be included in the HAZUS analyses</p>
<p>Brian noted that Saffa Bardaro said the website could go live by the end of the week. Ed sent the requested documentation to Saffa today. Rob inquired about the public notice for the website. Rob would like at least 45 days for the public to comment and see these documents on the website before forwarding the plan to FEMA.</p>	<p>Rob asked Brian to check with Saffa to see if a press release could be sent within a week of the website going live</p>
<p><b><u>Action Plan</u></b></p>	
<p>Rob explained that this is a subjective method of review of the costs and the benefits of the proposed actions. The goal is to show that the project is both beneficial and cost effective. Brian suggested that they use their existing watershed CIPs (both 6 year and 10 year) to identify projects and priorities for the action plans. Nancy brought up that their flood plans focus on benefit to life and safety not dollar amount. Rob explained that what is being considered is that the proposed projects are cost effective for FEMA. The committee expressed concern about the title as "Cost" and considered other titles such as "Estimated cost to the cost share agency or "Costs to external agency" so that the public would better understand what is meant by the "cost" category. The group questioned how one could determine the cost of human life and safety. Rob offered the information that FEMA considers cost of human life \$4.87 million per person.</p>	
<p>Rob reminded the group that action plans must address each of the five hazards</p>	

## Meeting Summary

Item	Action
<p>identified in the hazard mitigation plan and additional discussion ensued about using the CIPs to help identify these actions. Rob articulated his concern that if the flood plan methodology is used, the same methodology will need to be used for all hazard types, not just floods. [2010 = low (money available), 2011 (6 to 10 years) = medium, beyond 10 years = high]. Rob reminded the committee that high means the cost to the community is high because they have no money to fund the project.</p>	
<p>A levee funding project was brought up, however Rob confirmed that FEMA doesn't fund levees so the Brisco levee point is moot.</p>	
<p>Both new and existing structures must be included as actions according to FEMA's 2008 update/guidelines. Rob explained that "new" could include new facility pump houses, new dams, and could include "total demolish and rebuild" structures. "Existing" projects would mean retrofitting existing pump houses, elevating existing bridges or making repairs to existing structures.</p>	
<p>The committee members again discussed taking projects from the CIP that they would be most likely to seek funding from FEMA grants or public assistance (after a disaster). Since buyouts, elevations and revetment repairs are the most likely to be funded, Brian suggested that the group focus on those types of projects. Rob also urged the group to consider the following actions: "Continue to operate and maintain the flood warning center (since it has an earthquake component)"; "Continue to educate the public about flood hazards"; and "Continue to support the CRS program".</p>	
<p>Rob again reminded the group that each identified hazard (Landslide, Earthquake, Lahar, Flood and Wildfire) must each be included in the action plan for the entire Flood Control District (not each watershed). Wildfire hazards and mitigation techniques such as re-vegetating an area after a wildfire were discussed. Rob offered that a possible action would be to develop a policy regarding de-natured levees/hillsides. Priscilla Kaufmann suggested doing a literature review to analyze policy feasibility for re-vegetating after a wildfire. Rob suggested that actions be broad in scope and that any potential partners be identified (such as the Dept of Military, DNR and Parks and Rec).</p>	
<p>The group questioned possible actions to address the lahar hazard. Rob suggested partnering with other communities who have existing lahar warning systems ("seek other opportunities to partner with other lahar warning system communities"). Another action to consider would be "sharing information within plan to support or coordinate with CERT".</p>	
<p>Brian spoke about including all district hazards within the public outreach information (such as earthquakes can cause flooding by weakening levees, lahars are floods, etc).</p>	
<p>Time frames for projects were discussed by the group. Rob noted that project initiation within 5 years would qualify as short-term and anything projected to begin after 5 years would be considered a long-term project.</p>	
<p>Project benefits were discussed. Benefits will be determined through existing planning methodologies. A dollar amount/cost column will need to be added to the spreadsheet.</p>	<p>Basin Leads will populate the matrix with projects by watershed Rob will email the digital matrix to the committee</p>
<p>Rob requested that watershed basin plans be sent to him electronically within two</p>	

## Meeting Summary

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

weeks.

Rob will work with Priscilla to come up with greater county actions.

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

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

The next meeting date is:

**Wednesday, January 20, 2010, 2009 from 1:00 to 3:00 PM**

Location to be announced.