

Agenda
King County Flood Control Zone District
6th Planning Team Meeting
Wednesday, January 20, 2010
1:00-3:00

Objectives

- Risk Assessment-Dam Failure update
 - Outreach update
 - Review/revise action plans
-

Introductions		1:00 PM
• Review/approve minutes		
Risk Assessment Update-Dam Failure	Rob Flaner Tetra Tech	1:10 PM
• Review updated maps		
• Status of data request-Howard Hansen/Mud Mountain		
Outreach Update	Rob Flaner/ Saffa Bardaro	1:30 PM
• Website		
• Public meetings		
• Press releases		
Action Plan	Rob Flaner	1:45 PM
• Review projects by basin		
• Do we have at least 1 initiative for each Hazard of Concern?		
• Prioritization-how		
Action Items for Next Meeting	Rob Flaner	2:55 PM
Adjourn		3:00 PM

MEETING SUMMARY

Date of Meeting: January 20, 2010
Subject: 6th Planning Committee meeting
Project Name: KCFCD-LHMP
In Attendance: Jason Wilkinson, Ken Zweig, Priscilla Kaufmann,
Nancy Faegenburg,
Planning Team - Rob Flaner
Not Present:
Summary Prepared by: Rob Flaner – January 20, 2010
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.

Revised Timeline

Rob discussed the revised timeline for the project. Initially, the project was being implemented under an expedited time-line to facilitate the processing of the grant applications submitted by the District under FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) for the January 2009 flood event. The initial time-line called for plan completion by January 2010. Based on input from WAEMD, the Surface Water Group has been asked to rescind its HMGP application for the Wilderness Rim acquisition project, and re-submit the application under FEMA's Flood Mitigation Assistance grant program (FMA). The basis for this was request was the limited funding available under the HMGP program versus the number of applications the State had received requesting funding under this program. WAEMD felt that the Wilderness Rim project had better chances of funding under FMA. Since there is no limit on the number of applications under FMA, the Surface Water Group could submit an application as King County which has an approved Hazard Mitigation Plan, and eliminate the need to apply under the District to meet limitations imposed by the state under the HMGP program.

This change in plans has allowed for more time for the District to complete its plan. It is still the District's desire to complete its plan in time for eligibility for the FY 2011 PDM grant cycle which is anticipated to open sometime in June of 2010. So working backwards from FEMA approval in June, Rob discussed the milestones that would need to be met to meet that objective. These milestones are as follows:

- Plan adoption by District, June 2010
 - Draft Plan submitted to WAEMD with request for pre-adoption review by
-

Meeting Summary

Item	Action
<p>April 15, 2010.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Completion of public involvement strategy by March 15, 2010.• Completion of the risk assessment by the end of February 2010.• Completion and approval of the action plan at the February PC meeting.	
<u>Risk assessment update-Dam Failure</u>	
<p>Ed has received the new dam failure inundation data on the Tolt Dam from Seattle City Light. The inundation map illustrating the probable maximum flood has been prepared and was presented to the group for their review. No requests for changes were made.</p>	
<p>The discussion moved to what to do about those dams that inundation mapping was not available (Howard Hanson, Masonry and Mud Mountain). Ken Zweig felt that there might be good data available from Seattle City Light on the Cedar River Complex based on his review of the maps in the EAP for those facilities. The status of the letter that was crafted requesting information from Dam Operators was not known since Katy was not at meeting. Priscilla will follow-up with Katy on this.</p>	<p>Ed to Check with Seattle City Light on data for the Cedar river complex. Priscilla to check with Katy on the status of the letter to Dam Operators.</p>
<p>As far as Howard Hanson goes, Rob suggested that we use the scenario mapping for the 25,000 CFS scenario produced by the USACE, and refer to it as best available data. Rob felt that the State would not accept any plan that stated that there was no information available to assess the risk to Howard Hanson. The existing dam failure data is not useable, and this new data is in fact the best available data for this system, We cannot refer to this as the “probable maximum flood” like we do on the other dams, because this is not what this data reflects. We will need to establish some correlation based on recent certifications from the Corps. Those in attendance agreed that this was a good approach. However, they did feel that this would need to be approved by Steve or Brian before proceeding down this road.</p>	<p>Priscilla to check with Steve and/or Brian on using the 25,000 cfs scenario as best available data for Howard Hanson. Ken to send the 25,000 CFS data to Ed.</p>
<u>Outreach Update</u>	
<p>Since Saffa was not in attendance, discussion on this topic was tabled until the next meeting. It should be noted that the Website was still awaiting deployment. It is hoped that the website will go live by 1/22/10.</p>	
<u>Action Plan</u>	
<p>The balance of the meeting was dedicated to reviewing the action plan for the plan. There is still a great deal of confusion within the PC on how to prioritize the action plan. Because of this confusion, few if any of the action plans have been completed by the basin Leads. So the group worked on ways to establish a prioritization scheme that better reflected what the District has already done while meeting the requirements specified under the DMA. Rob stressed that the key point we need to address is prioritizing the action plan with an emphasis on benefits versus costs. To meet this requirement, we must be able to compare apples to apples. Brian had prepared a spreadsheet that listed all of the capital projects for the district contained in its 6-year CIP. This spreadsheet illustrated most of the required information needed for the action plan including project description, project costs and year of implementation. After reviewing this information, the group felt that the key pieces were in place within existing</p>	

Meeting Summary

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

programs. We just need to establish new definitions using the low, medium, high context that correlate to the existing District protocols, namely the current prioritization scheme utilized by the District that evaluates the flood risk reduction of a project. Following this approach, those in attendance came up with the following definitions for prioritization of the action plan:

For project costs, the action plan would reflect the actual costs from the 6-year CIP and assign a cost factor of high, medium or low based on the following:

- Low = a project cost of less than \$1 million
- Medium = a project cost of \$1 million to \$5 million
- High = a project cost greater than \$5 million

For project benefits, the action plan would reflect the flood risk reduction factor determined by the established District prioritization scheme (% flood risk reduction). A benefit factor would then be assigned based on the following definitions:

- Low = 33% or lower
- Medium = 34% to 66%
- High = 67% or higher

There was some discussion on how to evaluate programmatic actions following this approach. Programmatic actions are not assigned a risk reduction factor under the District prioritization scheme. However, Jason felt that this could be a fairly simple exercise applying the criteria to the identified programmatic actions. The group reviewed and defined 6 programmatic actions that would be feasible recommendations in the plan. Jason agreed to assign the risk reduction factors to those tasks.

To facilitate completion of the action plan, Rob will take the 6 year CIP prepared by Brian and populate the action plan using the methodology described above. This will include the programmatic actions that Jason will refine. The 6-year CIP will need to be refined eliminating those projects that have already been completed. Once completed, the action plan will be circulated to all Basin Leads for their review. This will occur prior to the next PC meeting so that the action plan can be approved at that meeting. Rob will also include the write-up that will precede that action plan that explains the prioritization scheme so that the PC can confirm its clarity and support of the action plan.

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, February 17, 2010 from 1:00 to 3:00 PM

Location to be announced.

Jason to send detailed project descriptions from 6-year CIP to Rob

Priscilla/Jason to review 6-year CIP with Brian to refine the list, removing those projects that have been completed

Jason to evaluate programmatic recommendations using District prioritization scheme

Rob to complete action plan using new methodology and provide to Basin Leads prior to next PC meeting