

**April 4, 2008**

---

## **Meeting Attendees**

### **Committee Members**

Richard Bonewits, King County Unincorporated Area Councils  
Tim Clark, City of Kent  
Grant Degginger, City of Bellevue  
Mike Flowers, City of Carnation  
Bruce Harrell, City of Seattle  
Kenneth Hearing, City of North Bend  
Layne Barnes, City of Maple Valley  
Matt Larson, City of Snoqualmie  
Joan McBride, City of Kirkland  
Bill Peloza, City of Auburn  
Michael Park, City of Federal Way  
Ron Sims, King County

### **King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks, Water and Land Resources Division Staff**

Sandy Kilroy, Regional Services Section Manager  
Brian Murray, Advisory Committee Project Manager  
Joanna Richey, Deputy Director

### **Committee Staff**

Margaret Norton-Arnold, Facilitator  
Amanda Sparr

## **Meeting Overview**

---

The first 2008 King County Flood Control Zone District (FCZD) Advisory Committee meeting was held on Friday April 4 from 9 a.m. to noon at Bellevue City Hall. This was the first of three meetings scheduled for Spring 2008; a fourth meeting of the committee is anticipated for October 2008.

The meeting focused on three primary areas: review of newly revised criteria for the evaluation of potential capital improvement projects, the distribution of the Sub-Regional opportunity fund, and the 2008 schedule and work program for the committee.

## **2008 Flood Control Capital Projects and Refined Evaluation Criteria**

---

Brian Murray described the approved capital projects for 2008, which included a detailed description of notable projects underway and their funding sources. Fifty-five flood protection capital projects have been scheduled for 2008, which is a sharp increase from the 2-3 per year that have previously been managed by King County. Most of these projects are focused on necessary repairs due to the 2006 floods. A particularly notable accomplishment has been the completion of the Briscoe Levee rehabilitation. The buyout of Cedar Grove Mobile Home Park is also nearly complete.

Partnering with the Army Corps of Engineers has leveraged \$10 million in federal dollars. King County staff have also submitted FEMA grant applications for two additional buyout projects, and FEMA has granted preliminary approval for these grants.

Responding to a question from the committee, staff said that 80% of the approximate \$32 million generated by the new levy will be spent on capital improvement projects, and 20% of that funding will be spent on operational programs and program administration.

Brian described proposed changes to the evaluation criteria used to determine which capital projects will be included on the annual work program. Both the Basin Technical Committees (BTCs) and the Advisory Committee had previously asked for refinements to the criteria. Particularly notable among the proposed refinements were “project readiness”, that is, giving greater weight to those projects that have been designed and are essentially ready to be constructed now. Another among the list of six proposed refinements was “leveraging”, that is, District funds can be leveraged through cost-sharing agreements and grants with external partners. Brian provided a graphic that highlighted how the potential for “flood risk reduction” would be balanced against “implementation opportunity potential” in order to arrive at the best list of projects for implementation.

The Basin Technical Committees had recommended that the Advisory Committee approve the revisions to the evaluation criteria. In general, the committee agreed with the modified evaluation criteria and were supportive of the BTCs’ recommendations. Some members were concerned, however, that the criteria and associated language relating to “potential economic loss” had somehow been minimized as the evaluation criteria were refined. They wanted

to ensure that this criteria was once again placed front and center, giving it high priority and weight. A member commented that, after all, this was important “truth in advertising” – the levy had been largely justified in terms of the potential devastating regional economic losses that could occur without enhanced levee protection and other flood control projects. Specific examples of regional economic impacts included employment centers and freight mobility.

King County staff responded that they would reinforce that message in finalizing the revised set of evaluation criteria. Committee members asked that the new language be circulated via email prior to being finalized.

### **Committee Recommendation**

---

The committee voted unanimously to endorse the newly revised criteria as recommended by the Basin Technical Committees, with the caveat that “economic consequences and severity” needed stronger emphasis. Given the committee’s unanimous endorsement of the criteria, those criteria will now be used to evaluate potential 2009 projects. The Basin Technical Committees will commence on this evaluation over the next several weeks.

### **Distribution of the Sub-Regional Opportunity Fund**

---

The Board of Supervisors (aka King County Council) determined that 10%, of the total anticipated FCZD levy funding, or \$3.2 million, should be set aside every year for “sub-regional” projects, that is, individual cities and unincorporated areas within King County will be able to use this funding for identified projects within their jurisdictional boundaries.

Three questions were put before the Committee in this regard:

- 1) Should jurisdictions have to compete for this funding, or should each jurisdiction receive funding in proportion to the amount their property owners have contributed to the Flood Control Zone District?
- 2) Should jurisdictions have significant flexibility in determining how to use the money, or should the funds be used strictly for “flood control” projects?
- 3) Should the funds be available for use on any river system, or should they be limited for use on the river systems that are not already included in the Flood Control Zone District?

In general, members were highly supportive of the option to simply allocate the funding in proportion to the amount of money actually received through the levy

from each of the jurisdictions. This had been the recommendation of the Basin Technical Committees, as well. In particular, the Advisory Committee noted that the administrative time and money that would be required for a “competitive” process would be a detrimental drain on resources, and ultimately not worth the effort.

One committee member expressed the concern that, for some of the jurisdictions, the amount of money that would be received is so small that nothing could be funded for that amount. Other committee members responded, however, that funds between jurisdictions can be combined and leveraged, and said that the jurisdictions would work together to make certain viable projects are funded as a result of Inter-Local Agreements and other mechanisms.

There was discussion on how the money allocated for unincorporated areas would be apportioned, given the size of the unincorporated area. A member expressed the concern that this money could be spent on surface water or other projects that are not the most appropriate uses of FCZD monies. The discussion continued that the county could allocate dollars for eligible projects just as a city could.

A recommendation was made that the funding available to the unincorporated area be utilized in part to do projects with cities within the Proposed Annexation Areas (PAAs). The amount of dollars raised in the PAAs could be used in that PAA in cooperation with city dollars. The remaining unincorporated dollars would be used in the remaining unincorporated areas based on projects and needs.

The committee was also highly supportive of allowing for flexibility in how the money is spent, noting that very often flood control projects are closely linked to habitat recovery efforts. They wanted jurisdictions to have the flexibility necessary to do the best job possible within their own boundaries. The committee was also supportive of allowing jurisdictions to determine, for themselves, which river systems or other geographical areas could benefit the most from the expenditure of funds. Both of these options had also been endorsed by the Basin Technical Committees.

### **Committee Recommendation**

---

After discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to support:

- 1) A proportional allocation of funds based on the jurisdiction’s contribution to the Flood Control Zone District levy fund, including a proportional allocation of

the unincorporated area funds to the PAAs (depending on project availability) and the remaining unincorporated area.

2) Flexibility for the jurisdictions in determining the types of projects to fund as eligible under the RCW.

3) Flexibility for the jurisdictions in determining where these funded projects should be located.

While the Committee was clear in its deliberations and unanimous in their support of these recommendations, a final vote will be held at the next meeting.

### **2008 Advisory Committee Schedule and Work Program**

---

Upcoming meetings for the FCZD Advisory Committee are as follows:

**First week of May:** Review and discuss Basin Technical Committee recommendations for 2009 Capital Improvement Projects. Review and discuss proposed FCZD operating budget. Discuss the upcoming election of a chair and vice-chair, as well as the adoption of Committee by-laws.

**End of May:** Finalize Committee recommendations related to the CIP list and operating budget. Elect chair and vice-chair, and adopt by-laws.

Brian Murray asked that Committee members contact him if they are interested in taking a tour of any of the FCZD project areas. This could easily be arranged in association with one of the upcoming meetings.

An annual report will be submitted to the Board of Supervisors in August; the Committee will review this report prior to its being submitted to the Board. The Committee will reconvene in October to hear about progress made on the 2008 Capital Improvement Projects.