

# King County Flood Hazard Management Plan Update Citizen's Committee Meeting # 3

MINUTES FEBRUARY 15, 2012

MERCER ISLAND COMMUNITY AND EVENT CENTER

FACILITATOR	Tamie Kellogg, Kellogg Consulting Inc.
NOTE TAKER	Melissa Plotsky/Priscilla Kaufmann
ATTENDING	Leonard Carlson, Bob Freitag, Dave Gashler, Warren Halverson, Joe Herr, John King, Molly Lawrence, James McBride, Martha Parker, Jeff Randall, Stephen Stanley, Keith Swensen, Joseph Wartman, Brian Winslow – <b>Staff:</b> Steve Bleifuhs, John Engel, Priscilla Kaufmann, Tamie Kellogg, Clint Loper, Brian Murray, Jennifer Rice, Jeanne Stypula
NOT ATTENDING	Nicole Hagestad, Gilbert Pauley, Susan Paleaz, and Jon Scholes

## AGENDA TOPICS

5 MINUTES	WELCOME AND STAFF INTRODUCTIONS	TAMIE KELLOGG
DISCUSSION	<p>Tamie Kellogg welcomed meeting attendees and thanked them for participating, briefly introduced the purpose of the meeting, and had all members briefly introduce themselves. It was decided to review the previous meeting's minutes later in the meeting, as not all Committee members had arrived (due to traffic issues).</p>	
1 HOUR 10 MINUTES	ROLE OF FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT IN COASTAL FLOODING	BRIAN MURRAY
DISCUSSION	<p>Brian gave a high-level overview of the Flood Control District's history and methodology toward coastal flooding, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a history of the 2006 Flood Plan</li> <li>the 2006 Flood Plan's focus on "major rivers and significant tributaries"</li> <li>the Council's interest in addressing Capital repair needs on major rivers</li> <li>prioritization policies and project evaluation approaches</li> <li>pre-2008 funding sources</li> <li>current funding levels and future funding needs</li> <li>geographic scope and resource allocation</li> <li>an overview of current coastal flooding action plans, land use recommendations and capital projects</li> </ul> <p>Prior to introducing the alternatives to consider in discussing <b>whether the Flood Control District's capital program should include funding for coastal and erosion reduction projects</b>, Brian explained that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>each option represents a different place on the Geographic Scope &amp; Resource Allocation chart</li> <li>each of the options were decided upon after discussions with City staff, advisory staff, and the Flood District</li> <li>the goal of the evening's discussions was to get feedback on the options from members of the Citizens Committee.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternatives:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Capital funding used for river and stream flooding only; limit coastal funding to existing commitments previously adopted by the Board.</li> <li>2. Capital funding for coastal areas only if the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers finds there is a federal interest in the project.</li> <li>3. Capital funding for coastal areas is considered only to reduce risk to public property or infrastructure.</li> <li>4. Capital funding for coastal areas is evaluated based on consequence, severity, and urgency alongside other flood risk reduction actions.</li> <li>5. Capital funding for coastal areas should be provided only on the condition that additional resources are provided such that other projects are not deferred, and</li> </ol>	

	there is a significant cost-share from other funding sources.
<b>SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE COMMENTS</b>	The Committee's feedback was in support of Alternative #1 to continue to focus capital funding on river and stream flooding and to not divert funding for future coastal projects that are not already adopted by the Board. There was concern that using capital funding on coastal projects is not consistent with the 2006 Flood Hazard Management Plan, and there was little support to update the Plan to supporting coastal flood risk reduction projects since there appeared to be agreement that the main flood risk in King County comes from river flooding.
<b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS</b>	<b>KING COUNTY RESPONSE</b>
<b>Committee Member Question:</b> Who made the decision to spend that million dollars?	The Flood District Board of Supervisors and the King County Council.
<b>Committee Member Question:</b> Is there a review process of some sort?	It went through the Basin Technical Committee which is the basin's City staff, up to the Advisory Committee which is a group of 15 different mayors who had a lot of discussion around this topic, and then to the Board of Supervisors, who ultimately made the decision.
<b>Committee Member Question:</b> What kind of political pressure did they receive from Seattle to make that unbelievable decision?	I think it basically came down to the Board of Supervisors took these recommendations, which are included in your packet, from the Advisory Committee's range of opinions – some supportive, some not. Some were supportive because they felt it was an important project, others because it was regional, others because there was some sort of political aspect to it – which Seattle contributes a significant amount of the revenue and they need to show their taxpayers some reasonable level of funding. It's a highly subjective discussion as to what "reasonable" is. Basically, when the Board finally made a decision on this, after a lot of discussion – and, yes, I will say that it was contentious and difficult – they cited that the fact that there is a Corps of Engineers report that cites the Federal interests in the Seattle Sea Wall – because this is not just an important regional need, this sea wall has a big impact if it fail – the regional, economic impacts, the commercial development, the infrastructure of the place – the highway, the terminal and everything else. Not only did they put in an appropriation, but they adopted technical language to the 2006 Flood Plan to make it clear that the sea wall is part of that 2006 plan. And they committed \$30 million over this time frame that is about 10% of the total cost of the sea wall, at least according to the Corps estimate. So, again, this is not about whether or not they should put funding toward the sea wall, it's about – [interrupted by next question]
<b>Committee Member Question:</b> I question the 10% -- how can 30 million be 10%?	There are two segments of the sea wall and they're each about \$300 million. So, to be clear, it's probably best to not even think about it in terms of percentages. It's \$30 million dollars. The commitment is for a

	<p>phase that is doing design – it's for a four-year period of design. If the costs change, as they often do, we shall see what happens with that.</p> <p>The Flood Commitment not a percentage. It is \$30 million.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> This is a very big deal when you talk regionally about coastal issues. We are losing our shoreline. And, if you go around Vashon or you go around anywhere on the coast, you'll see stages of development. You'll see a sea wall where someone's trying to protect a home, then you'll see a sea wall with some wind walls, and then you'll see a wall, a buttress and a wall in back. Because now the waves have really come along and taken material out. So, you see those stages. There's some real environmental issues that come with it. This is a big deal around the entire area. So the natural renourishment of the coastline that usually occurs isn't because we are starving the coast and the nature of the Sound is kind of unique anyway. So, if you look at what we're going to be faced with, with fighting off this bullet, is that every single bit of shoreline has a question of being armored. There are some ways to kind of address this – maybe – but from a regional standpoint on the coast, this is a big deal. As sea level rises, this may start to increase.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I'm wondering if that is what you're talking about when you're talking about coastal flooding. Because it's not clear to me that that's at all what they mean when they talk about coastal flooding.</p>	<p>As we go through the alternatives, what you'll see is that this is a very big issue. To what extent do we want to get involved in a very big issue? Is it none, is it a lot?</p> <p>One more frame of reference – in your packet there is a map – we just did a fairly quick and dirty exercise to get a sense of how much of the shoreline along King County is armored and how much of that is public versus private – just to get a sense of scale.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> Why do you use the terms "coastline" and "shoreline" interchangeably? One is the coast and one is the shore.</p>	<p>You're right. "Shoreline" is a broader term. I should be referring to it as "coastal." I recognize that in some people's minds "shoreline" probably refers to lakes and other things. Right now we're talking about coastal saltwater.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> What do you mean by "standard"?</p> <p>I understand that's what you've written, but what is your point? Is it that Alternative #3 requires that there be a higher standard of risk of damage on coastal projects than on river projects before they would be funded? Or is it the construction standard?</p> <p>So, you will determine that the standard is that you will protect</p>	<p>It places a higher burden on selecting the project. I mean that if we say we're only going to fund things that protect the public investment on the coast. We don't do that with rivers. What I'm saying is that it doesn't treat rivers and coastal areas on an apples-to-apples equitable basis.</p> <p>It's not about construction standards. We would only be willing to consider funding for coastal projects if there was public property involved. That's a different criteria than we currently have for rivers in the Flood Plan, where we're willing to provide funding even if there is not a publicly owned property or investment there.</p> <p>Yes. Whether or not that's a higher</p>

<p>only public projects on the coast, whereas you would also, for river projects, spend money to protect private property?</p>	<p>standard, I don't know, but that's the difference.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> What is the economic aspect of the project selection criteria?</p>	<p>As part of our criteria, we do have both the economic benefit and the economic impacts of the areas that are getting flooded. We also do look at an evaluation of whether or not the project is going to be cost effective and provide long-term risk reduction.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> When you look at the shoreline impact, it seems like they are more residential, but when you look at the rivers, it looks like they may have more of an economic impact, especially at the outlets.</p>	<p>Yes, I think that's true for both the lower Cedar in Renton and the Green. Generally, when we look at consequence in our system, there's the economic consequences – which is why the Green River Valley in particular and the lower Cedar score so high. The thing that scores highest in that particular aspect, though, is life safety. That is our fundamental issue, whether it's on the Tolt, which is a river that moves around a lot, or on the Green. If somebody's going to get flooded in the middle of the night, like what happened in the 2009 floods, those kinds of things rise to the top.</p> <p>Cross-benefit analysis is also a part of the criteria. Right now, we don't have a clear policy that says we're going to look at that house that might fall in at the bluff -- and do we want to be engaged in that in a greater way than we have in the past?</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> Have you done any analysis on the cost analysis? When I think about the Green and then I compare that to thinking about houses eroding away and I just want to know if you have done any analysis?</p> <p>What kind of coastal flooding do we experience on a non-armored shoreline or on an armored shoreline? I assume we're waiting for the sea wall to fail, so we haven't seen the flooding yet. Is it preventative, so we don't actually know what the flooding would look like and we can't map it?</p>	<p>The only place where we have the numbers – and that was done for us by the State Department of Transportation -- is for the sea wall and those numbers are huge.</p> <p>The happens to be the type of scenario that we've been hearing about -- we've got a sea wall, it's old, it may collapse, it hasn't collapsed yet.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> Why, on page six of your materials, is residential given a higher score than commercial?</p> <p>Yes, but people could be inside of the commercial buildings.</p> <p>It seems to me that in commercial areas, you're going to have more people gathered together and more concentrated – and the flooding isn't necessarily going to happen at night. It could happen in the daytime.</p>	<p>Because of the life safety issue.</p> <p>The reason we score it a little bit higher – and it's not much on that – is that in the residential areas if you have flooding in the middle of the night or if people are invalids, the odds are that people that work in a commercial area are hopefully awake and can get out. So, there's a greater urgency around residential areas.</p> <p>We have other factors in there about the severity of the flooding, which is the other criteria on the page there. It talks about is it localized versus the kinds of people impacted. So, they would perhaps score a little less on commercial versus residential, but higher on the severity because of exactly what you're describing.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> I don't understand the idea of "alternatives." "Alternatives" means to me "pick one." So, if</p>	<p>What we're trying to get input on is exactly what you just said. You're not a proponent</p>

<p>you pick #2, then how do you ensure that no public funding is used to rebuild private bulkheads and sea walls because you haven't picked #3. How do you take something that seems really important – to now protect private things – because I don't think we should, that should be the owner's responsibility. But if you don't pick #3, how do you play that out? Is that what we're trying to do here – come up with a pick one or pick them all? Combine them all? I don't get this alternatives thing.</p> <p>What I said was, if that's an alternative, then how do you then go to #2 --</p>	<p>of having the money spent on the private property -- [Tamie Kellogg]</p> <p>I understand what you're saying. Using the sea wall example, most of the development is commercial, sure there's public stuff, but there's also private commercial stuff that is protected by the sea wall. Are these inconsistent or are they not inconsistent? Are they mutually exclusive? That wasn't really our intent in thinking through this. This was intended to be public or private regardless. If someone says it's a Federal interest, it must be important. This is more like we're willing to look beyond just those limited Federal interest types of situations to say if there's a public or private structure then we're willing to put some money toward it. [Brian Murray]</p> <p>So, just to add to that, what we are looking for is you can create your own alternative. Just tell us where you think the funding should be spent relative to this coastal issue. [Tamie Kellogg]</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> There are some policy issues here. When I think of sea walls, I think of the same things as levees. And, I think that if you have an area that is threatened, that is protected by a levee, that you should consider maybe looking again at that levee. If there is an area that is not yet leveed, you don't want to put a levee in because a levee would actually create more risk than it takes away. The same way that a sea wall is like a levee is with commitment to armoring area for always and always. And, so there are maybe areas where there is a levee or a sea wall now, maybe there should be a sea wall. But, certainly, there should be a policy that you wouldn't create additional sea walls. The other thing when you look at downstream effects from the waters, you can say there's a lot of benefit for the city from wetlands and forests. There's also a lot of benefit to shorelines from collapsing bluffs along that literal drift. And, we do have somewhat of a literal drift going north along the city. So there are some issues that you could provide some benefits, not directly, by building a sea wall, just like directly on a river by building a levee. But there is some buffering you can do that should be part of the equation, along with some policy that really limits the amount of activity. Because, once you put a sea wall in, you create a hard edge, you take that energy, you force that energy down, you just create a situation where there's maintenance for always. So, there's some policy that has to be decided on.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I think you're taking me too far, too fast. I really think you've opened Pandora's Box – and it's maybe going to be impossible to get out. Let me just make a couple of comments. First of all, in referring to your slide #5</p>	

that shows the projects. I see the project list and I think they're really well done and I think it would be very useful for you all, from a staff standpoint, to look at those projects and designate how many of them are going to be high priorities and how many of them are going to be completed and are you capable of funding those. Because that is reason this whole Flood Control group was put together and everyone voted for an increase in the amount of money. Until then, I think you're opening Pandora's Box.

Now, the sea wall thing – boy – I can understand the political pressures and I can understand everything that went on. It must have been terrible for you. It must have been absolutely terrible. But, once you open that up, you're going to be going into an area of politics that you are never going to be able to do the priority things that I think a lot of us along the rivers and streams think are really important.

Let me just add on a couple of other little comments. I did have a place down on the South Sound ten years ago. I went through the whole permit process and paid \$50,000 for 160 feet of bulkhead. Think about what you're opening up now. Sea walls, bulkheads, water systems, drainage systems. It's almost incomprehensible. So, I think it's really important that you do define it. I'm agreeing that you need to define it. But I really think you're going to get this thing way off track if you open it up to coastal. I agree that the coastal area has a lot of needs, but that's not the question for our group. I think the question for our group isn't how important an issue is; it is the focus, funding, and the white light of what we're going to be doing the next few years to be really successful.

I was really, quite frankly, shocked that this even came up here.

That's what I'm saying, but I'm also saying that I think a review of the projects to determine the priorities. You've got it all set up here, now just tell me how many of the high priority ones have been done today and are funded for the next few years – fully funded and they are going to be done. And then we'll talk about the coast or something else.

Let me say just a couple of other things. I'm concerned as a citizen about cross-jurisdictional areas of government. I'm concerned that the city, the state, the county, the federal aren't working together. The final thing I'm concerned about is that I'm concerned about where the money goes. I've been asked I don't know how many times in the last few years – surveyed by the Indians, by the City of Snoqualmie, by the County, by the Federal government – surveyed and surveyed. So, my basic point is, I'm interested in giving input, but my essential point is, how much money is being used by capital dollars, how much money is going into that rather than spending it? So, I think you're going to open it up to a lot more studies. You're becoming a research institute like University of Washington, rather than kind of getting something done.

**Committee Member Comment:** This may sound like heresy, but what about projects that might undo projects on certain shorelines where it might be a benefit for them, such as undoing levees or certain ill-advised structures? It would seem

So, can I ask, if these were alternatives on the table, you'd be saying #1 – no more coastal projects beyond the one we've got. [Tamie Kellogg]

When it comes to this scoring and whether or not it has an impact on our ability to get projects done, the two sides to this would be, if you add new expenditures for anything that wasn't part of the original ten-year plan, it's going to displace something else. So, we don't have money to do all the things that we've agreed to plus something more. Fundamentally, it's a push me, pull you; it doesn't work. But the flipside to that argument is, if there are new things of a higher priority, then, yes, we should be doing them by deferring the things that are lower priority. If you really want to be risk-based, then focus on the highest priority.

So, your recommendation would be one that says -- [from commenter] "basically, look to the science." [Tamie Kellogg]

<p>to me that by saying, “no more of such and such,” we don’t want to inadvertently prevent an action that could actually improve things by moving it back to a more natural system.</p>	<p>I think that when you look at our guiding objectives or the guiding principles, things like “recognize flooding as a natural process and try to work with those processes to get to a long-term sustainable solution” – we do that on rivers now, or try to wherever we can, but, if I’m hearing you correctly, it’s “if you do anything on the coast, make sure you apply it by that approach rather than fighting something” [Brian Murray]</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> When was the sea wall built and how much public versus private money went into it?</p>	<p>I don’t have answers for all of that. If I remember correctly, it goes back to the 30s. [NOTE: The Seattle sea wall was completed in 1934.]</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I’ve got a basic philosophy and that’s that we have to get along with freshwater and if we make that decision, all the other things go away. We take care of the main issue, which is flooding of the rivers – not the sea wall, tsunamis or whatever, because we don’t have the money to do that.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I’m a little hacked off that they turned around and after they got the money they gave it away right away because that was never the intent when we put the Plan together and it was originally rolled out. I’d say stop throwing the money around. I’d definitely be in the #1 category there.</p> <p>Another frustration from the original committee – and I’m probably paraphrasing this a little – but we looked at the problems with the Green river and said, “this is a massive problem,” and I think the Corps of Engineers approach was “not our problem.”</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I think the two of us are coalescing around #1 and I could support that in terms of these options. I think that the sea wall is a fundamentally different issue because it seems to be so far off from the focus of flood hazard management that I think the risk of that is that we work so hard to try to convince the public to invest in public safety and infrastructure that I think we risk betraying that trust if a bond measure is passed and public money is then reallocated for other projects. This is not to say that these other projects are not critical, but I think we need to do more to convince the public that those are other critical projects as well that are certainly deserving of funding. I think that your really risk really losing focus – and, at the end, not having much in the way of meaningful accomplishments if we start to spread the funding out and broaden the concerns of the flood management plan.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> According to page 12 of material on seawall, they already started design even before the Advisory Committee made their recommendation. That’s not so good.</p> <p>There was also a proposal to increase the tax break on the Flood Control District. This, again, speaks to a trust problem.</p>	<p>On the first part about Seattle spending money on design before the Flood District made a recommendation, it’s because Seattle already has its own money and Corps money to get started. Seattle is the lead and the County just has an agreement to transfer the money to them. Just to be clear, no one started anything before funding was approved. It was because it’s such an important thing to the City of Seattle, for all the reasons we’ve talked about, that they invested their own money. They just don’t have enough to do the</p>

<p>I guess I want to ask, why doesn't Seattle pay for its sea wall?</p> <p>Yes. I see Flood Control District expanding and expanding and asking for more and more money and the number of people hired increasing and it's a problem.</p>	<p>whole thing and the Corps has committed money already because of that Federal interest that somebody already referred to. It's not \$600- or \$300 million dollars yet.</p> <p>Would I assume, then, that you're kind of over there on the "no more coastal projects" side of things? [Tamie Kellogg]</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> My thought, if you look at this from sort of a landscape processes approach, you're really looking at two different processes systems. You're looking at a marine near shore system versus a freshwater system. Flooding of the freshwater system is dependent upon the upstream conditions. The factors that you're dealing with when it comes to the sea wall are an entirely different set of processes. Right now, the way the science is progressing, there is a distinct difference between the two. I think it would be hard from that matrix, if we were to argue that we're providing funding for near-shore renovation (?) of sea walls, it doesn't have a lot of support in the science. It's really a separate issue. If we were going to address it, I think you'd need to come up with some sort of coefficient that would look at the economic loss that that sea wall would cause, divided by the total loss to the whole system, and then apply that to what people in Seattle would pay. There would have to be some fairness there to really consider that #4. I think I favor #1 more so, just because of the fact that we're mixing watershed processes with near-shore processes.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> If we expand our horizons to include coastal processes, is that going to impact your staffing? Are you going to have to have more staff? Is it going to increase your overhead?</p>	<p>My take on that is that, our group, historically, currently, and in the future, has its focus on rivers. We're river engineers, ecologists, program people. There are people elsewhere that do sea walls and it's generally not us. The current funding arrangement is that we're just transferring money to the City to do that work with the Corps. So, I would not see us taking on coastal engineering.</p>
<p>How can you evaluate it if you don't have the expertise?</p>	<p>That would be a challenge.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I just want to say that when you say the coastal issues are sea walls, it's like saying the river issues are levees.</p>	<p>I appreciate that. I'm over-simplifying it.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I want to kind of back up to what [previous commenter] just said, which was that a few years ago when we rewrote this whole plan, there was no thought in mind that we were going to do anything with the sea wall in Seattle. I mean, I don't think it was mentioned, we weren't thinking about it. I don't think it was the intent of the Flood District or the intent of the voters when they put this before them and said that they were going to raise their property taxes to control river flooding that \$30 million was going to go to be spent on the sea wall of Seattle. That just floors me.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I agree with the previous comments. Apples and oranges, I think we should concentrate on the rivers.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I just Wikipedia "Seattle sea wall" and discovered that the sea wall was constructed in 1916 and completed in 1939 for the purpose of providing driving</p>	

lanes and for easier access to the docks for unloading ships. So, the city built it for that purpose and it's theirs and they should fix it.

**Committee Member Comment:** I guess I'm feeling incredibly manipulated from the perspective that if I look at the number of people who are involved. We were all selected for our involvement in river watershed work. As far as I know, there's nobody in this room who is a coastal person.

Another reason why I feel manipulated is because I know the politics at the Advisory Committee level. There is a lot of concern, as I understand it, about certain jurisdictions getting a lot more dollars than others. So, I feel a little bit like we're being used in order to affirm the decision of the Flood Control District to stay with rivers and to tell the other jurisdictions that, no, you're not going to get money.

There is a downtown Seattle business representative who is not here.

The Flood District hasn't decided to stay with rivers. They've actually just explicitly decided to put \$32 million toward the sea wall. What they're looking for is clarity about what goes forward. To give a little bit of context, and hopefully ameliorate some of those concerns, we will be hearing a very strong statement about the importance of coastal issues from some of the cities along the coast. We heard it already and that is why this is here.

To be candid, the discussion which is covered in note here, from that Advisory Committee meeting was everyone was supportive of the idea. That is why they set up a new property tax to fund it. To keep the order of magnitude increase of \$36 million a year, 35% of that comes from one jurisdiction – the City of Seattle. So, the conversation went a little like this: "We need to make sure that you and your citizens feel like you can be supportive of this regionally significant flood district."

The argument for the Flood District is that it has regional significance – jobs, all sorts of economic activity. With regard to the Green River and lower Cedar in particular, it is regionally significant. I think that politically, it stems from different ideas of what "regional" means and it depends on which table you're at. If you're Seattle, Bellevue, Federal Way, Shoreline or some of the jurisdictions that objected to the Flood Control District in the first place, they would look at it and say, we understand the whole concept, but we also have a lot of our own needs that we would like to see represented.

I think the intention of this graphic was to show that there are many issues at play with the decisions being made, and that all of those alternatives came from either the councils themselves, came from the Advisory Committee, came from the cities and the citizens groups. You're another layer of the conversation and getting to weigh in on it. [Tamie Kellogg]

I want to make sure everyone understands that the funding source issue is a property

	tax. The tax does not have to go back to the place from which it is collected. That is the fundamental difference between a tax and an assessment. The idea is county-wide importance, regional and county-wide, spend money where it is most needed. Anytime you have any amount of money that needs to be collected, you have to have this conversation.
<b>Committee Member Comment:</b> When we created this five years ago and when we just went into this right now, it's very much in the language that this is a living document and that at the present time we've got some significant issues in the river system. That does not mean to say that five years down the road from now there isn't a significant change. The funding mechanism would be there and it could be revisited. I don't see it as saying that for forever, we're not looking at it again.	

1 HOUR 15 MINUTES	ROLE OF FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT IN URBAN AND SMALL STREAMS FLOODING	BRIAN MURRAY
-------------------	--	--------------

DISCUSSION	<p>Brian gave an overview of urban flooding, urban actions to date, and explained the Geographic Scope and Resource Allocation for urban flooding projects.</p> <p>He introduced the following alternatives to consider in discussing <b>how Flood Control District funds should be allocated for urban flooding and small streams that are not the focus of the 2006 Flood Hazard Management Plan:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a first step toward achieving the intent of RCW 86.12.210, work with cities to inventory floodplain land use policies and regulations, and collaboratively identify ways to improve the integration of floodplain land use practices across jurisdictional boundaries.</li> <li>2. Evaluate all projects based on prioritization criteria; no direct allocation for the Opportunity Fund.</li> <li>3. Same as #2, but urban flooding problems are eligible if they cross jurisdictional boundaries.</li> <li>4. Opportunity Funds available only for those jurisdictions that do not have capital projects funded within their jurisdiction within a set timeframe (i.e. the prior year or two of appropriations).</li> <li>5. Revise Opportunity Fund to a competitive process.</li> <li>6. Increase Opportunity Fund allocation to jurisdictions. This increase could potentially be combined with options 3 or 4, and it could also be backed by additional revenue.</li> <li>7. Connect eligibility for capital project funding with compliance with land use policies and regulations that help to limit residual risk and reduce the need for more capital projects over time.</li> </ol>
------------	--

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE COMMENTS	<p>In general, the Committee appeared to think the Board made the right decision initially in allocating 10% of the funding for an opportunity fund that the cities could use for any program or project that is consistent with RCW 86.15. There was no support for increasing that percentage. Some Committee members liked the idea of allocating that 10% through a competitive process based on risk rather than just an automatic allocation to the cities. There was also support for allocating the opportunity fund to cities that agree to adopt strong floodplain management land use policies and regulations that exceed the minimum National Flood Insurance Program requirements.</p>
-------------------------------	--

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	KING COUNTY RESPONSE
<b>Committee Member Question:</b> When the cities buy into the King County Flood Plan, if they don't buy into it, do they get funding from King County?	That's one of the things we're going to talk about as an alternative. It's related to some of that discussion we had at our last meeting about the integration of land use – approaches, policies, and regulations.
<b>Committee Member Question:</b> Who's going to do that [inventory land use policies]?	As a planning thing, we haven't priced it out yet. It's something that the staff would do

<p>I think it would be a great university project. We do have some students who could do that.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> Can you explain what you mean by no direct allocation for the Opportunity Fund?</p>	<p>Yes. Everything is based on risk, so we stop carving off \$3.5 million. We currently have this direct allocation of \$3.5 million that gets pulled out of the CIP over ten years and it goes to the cities to do some very good things with it, but it's not part of the original plan.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> So eliminate the Opportunity Fund and throw it all into the mix, right?</p>	<p>Yes. Alternative #1 is to inventory. Alternative #2 is to take the Opportunity Fund away.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> Working for a government agency, it's rare, but sometimes we get a big pot of money and we're like, "What do we do with this money? Let's find something to spend it on." So, that's why I would vote for Option #2 because it's more risk based, instead of let's just allocate the money here and there – let's do it based on a risk and not just throw money at or allocate it evenly to the cities.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> Maybe I'm getting ahead of the slides here, but you might try combining those concepts. If you don't have some sort of lid, what you're going to do here is you're going to run yourself into that whole dilemma again of all these other priorities coming in. A 10% lid and some sort of prioritization.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> Looking at stream restoration, a lot of it is opportunistic. Somebody has a parcel of land and you have to work around that parcel of land. It might not be the best parcel of land to acquire because there's greater distance between other parcels of land, but certainly the opportunity presents itself. If you're going for opportunities that are risk-based in your applications for people as they come in, you still need some overall framework to work within. You can't just have of these 18 ideas, these are the top 5, but there are some that haven't come in and you may want to nurture that seem really significant, but they don't have an angel.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> The framework idea is currently being promoted by other portions in King County and groups in Puget Sound. They are actually developing restoration and protection priority through Puget Sound based on characteristics on water flow properties. So they will evaluate which areas on the watershed [muffled]. Within that framework, you can pick out watersheds which are in the order of about two- to three- square miles which will have a really high priority in terms of having a benefit of reducing downstream flooding, if you go and purchase houses there in those key areas. So, that's a framework that seems to making this decision in conjunction with the risk analysis, if we have that data available.</p>	<p>I think that concept could probably be applied in a couple of the alternatives.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> You talk about the bottom line. You talk about how a high priority flooding problem may be totally within a jurisdiction, so it doesn't cross a jurisdictional path.</p>	<p>That's a con to this. You may have an important, significant flood event that is entirely within the city.</p>
<p>Just to clarify, when you mention problem, it's the cause and the problem within the same jurisdiction.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> It seems to me that you're basing this on fairness, instead of some natural condition of the land. I'm having a hard time with that concept. I think we should all be fair, but that doesn't achieve another objective</p>	<p>The Opportunity Fund was not a risk-based thing based on the commission in the first place. So, if you're going to do something, make sure it's focused on achieving that</p>

<p>outside of being fair, unless there is a solid framework that you're working within.</p>	<p>flood objective.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> In all this, the opportunity may not be within the local community. You've mentioned several times that they only get \$200, \$500 – but, you may be able to solve everything by buying some rights upstream. That would really be an opportunity for that community, even though it's outside of the community. There are upstream impacts.</p>	<p>I didn't mean to imply that the city couldn't look outside of their jurisdiction for the solution. If you were going to have a competitive process that takes time to make a case for a project, the smaller jurisdictions may not have the resources to do that.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> This seems to me to create a whole other bureaucracy. It seems we'd burn who knows how many man hours.</p>	<p>Yes. One of our arguments for this direct allocation is we said, we're setting aside 10% of the money and we're likely to spend 90% of our time on it. I don't know if that's true, but it's a nice little bumper sticker version of it.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> Presently, what extent is this 10% Opportunity Fund being allocated into each of the sub-regions or communities or cities based upon the assessed value that provides the funding to them?</p> <p>So, it's obligated to make that expenditure?</p>	<p>It's directly tied to that.</p> <p>It's based on jurisdiction (the municipality). So, the City of Seattle contributes \$12.7 million and they get \$1.26 million back to spend within their jurisdiction. The same applies as you go down the list of each of the jurisdictions. So, King County does get a share of about \$400,000 and that gets put toward stormwater work.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> In my former life, I had budget responsibilities and there is an appetite, a good appetite and a positive appetite for unrestricted funds. It would be interesting to get the cities' perspective on how they would like to have this done. I could see very easily that, from a simplicity standpoint, that obviously, just allocating it is good. From the standpoint of the recipient, if they can match those funds or use them some way, it is obviously good. From a fairness standpoint, it is obviously good just to allocate it. From the priorities standpoint for them and for us, maybe it isn't good. But unrestricted funds are important.</p>	<p>I think that based on our experiences, it's good for those reasons. It's not completely unrestricted as it has to be used within the mandate, of course. The fact is that it frees them up to leverage other dollars and it gets projects done that they may not have been able to done otherwise. And, especially for the cities that only get a little bit of money. Cities like Bellevue and Kirkland do a lot of good work with it and really put it to good use. It's a popular program for the jurisdictions for that reason. As you get down to the bottom 16 or so that are the smallest, they're letting it accrue for several years because the dollar amounts are not that great.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> Just for clarification, what happens to the other 90% of the money? We're only talking about 10% of the money, but there's still 90% of the pot.</p> <p>Does it go toward programs in Skykomish? Or, can it go to anybody? Is it a competitive program or is it things you decide on?</p>	<p>That's the major capital program.</p> <p>It's based on the criteria that we use to evaluate capital projects, depending on consequences and urgency. Every year we update with the basic technical committees, which include representatives from each one of the jurisdictions and each one of the basins. We bring forward those recommendations to the Advisory Committee, which recommends them to the Board of Supervisors, who ultimately adopts the capital program. That list includes the major rivers, the sea wall and also two smaller streams that weren't part of the</p>

	<p>original Plan. The question is then, just like the coastal issue, can we provide some greater clarity so that people know going forward, should they be putting things in for consideration for this apples-to-apples comparison, regardless of major rivers or small streams, or should there be some other constraints or a different focus around that.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I wanted to see if it said somewhere where communities can form partnerships upstream? I mean, North Bend could save some money by building (?) their own levees. You know, that relationship has to be acknowledged. When you receive Opportunity Funds from one community, one of the major problems you have in this country, with our river systems, is that they are all connected even though we assume they're not. With some of this, you could incentivize some kind of ___ [muffled] on the watershed or along the WRIA or something that we would provide.</p>	
	<p>It's a lot to keep all five of these [alternatives] in your head and there's two more. I do think there one that is encouraging a multi-jurisdictional approach to solve a problem and that would make it more competitive.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I was just wondering if there is a different horse trade to be made. I mean this is clearly a horse trade. This is a political animal entirely...</p> <p>I think the idea of having different jurisdictions work together is really good. An alternative way of thinking about this is have you done an analysis of the dollars that go to the Opportunity Funds, that go to the jurisdictions, the same jurisdictions that need money to go toward the coastal projects? So, if Des Moines has a lot of property value because it has a lot of high value waterfront are they putting more money into the coffers of the Flood Control District and getting their 10% back that they can use for their personal property.</p> <p>Changing the Opportunity Fund is sort of a way to think about whether or not it is a way to get at the coastal fund.</p>	<p>That concept was suggested in discussions around the sea wall, along the lines of Seattle. The response was that they are already factoring that in to the project costs. They're putting the \$30 million request, plus the \$2 million feasibility, plus the Opportunity Funds toward it. So, if you got rid of that Opportunity Fund, they would ___ [muffled].</p> <p>I think for Des Moines and Normandy Park, if they had something along the coastal areas, the way it's defined now, it would be an eligible expense if they wanted to use the Opportunity Fund. The challenge is that Normandy Park gets something like \$35,000 and Des Moines and Burien are a little bit more, but it's not just on the scale that they need.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> Are the cities that don't buy into the King County Plan getting money?</p>	<p>As we discussed last time, one jurisdiction has adopted the Plan – that's the City of Kent. If you look at some of the others that have not adopted the Plan, they have very consistent regulations, they just haven't taken the step of adopting the Plan. That's one of the things we're going to get to – an understanding of why they don't agree – or, in some cases, we don't know if they agree or don't agree with what's in the Plan in terms of land use. Until we have that information, we can't really have a very</p>

	important discussion about how to integrate the Plan use policy.
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> What the Plan says right now is that it's not just about King County's regulations, but the NFIP regulations. So all the jurisdictions in King County have adopted that piece of the Plan. They may not have adopted the Plan as a whole, but all of the jurisdictions have adopted the NFIP regulations.</p>	<p>What Priscilla described last time is that the state has a statute that clearly says that if there is a county-wide flood plan, in which all the jurisdictions have participated in, then it needs to be adopted within ___ days or so. In the 2006 Plan, instead of saying "shall adopt," it says that adoption of NFIP standards is considered to be consistent – and that is very different than what we're about to talk about in one of the other options, which, like some folks have mentioned, setting some defined set of minimum requirements and saying that if you want money from the capital program, then you need to be consistent with it.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> There are certain things that grate. One of those things is "exceed minimum NFIP standards." You can exceed minimum standards by filling in the entire fringe if you wanted to. There are certain things that have been proven acceptable that have been challenged in court by the NFIP. Then you get in the policy of what you mean by "minimum."</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I just want to understand that when you talk about integrated land use policies and regulations that would include policies and regulations outside of the floodplain.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> I'm looking at one of the things, one of our reading materials here, and the Advisory Committee was 100% toward the Opportunity Fund. Who's bringing this to us now? Because, if the Advisory Committee and the Council said, "Hey, we love this 100% goal for 2008" then I don't understand who's bringing this to us. Are we wasting our time or have they changed their position? Or, do they want us to change their position? Is that why you're giving this to us – are you asking us to tell those people who made the decision in 2008?</p>	<p>No. Over the course of the last four years, each and every one of these options has been talked about by the Advisory Committee members, the Board Members of the King County Council, or the Executive Director of the Flood District. The issue that the Board specifically identified is what is the role of the Flood District in urban areas? And, the options that have been discussed so far – and there are far more than just these seven, the seven is unwieldy, but I'm sure there are more that can we can come up with –that the discussion has been largely focused around this flooding concept, apples-to-apples, using this criteria to different ways of creating a direct allocation to support city work so that the rest of our program can focus on major rivers.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> So, if I can reiterate, what I think you said is that the Advisory Committee has now looked back on their decision in 2008 and went, maybe there are better ways to skin the cat.</p>	<p>Let me clarify. The Advisory Committee does not make decisions. They make recommendations. The Board of Supervisors is the one that makes decisions. As part of the scope that the Board gave us, one of the topics was the coastal and urban issues – how do we deal with those risks? What we tried to do was encapsulate the ideas that we've heard so far. And, like you said, we're totally open to more alternatives if you come up with ones that you think make more sense. It tends to be a continuum based on full-on risk-based and there's an important project in the city and just</p>

	<p>because it's a small stream, if it has regional significance and it scores well on the criteria – as someone said earlier, the Plan is full of good stuff, but the world changes and there may be other things we need to consider as it is a living document, so we may need to bring in some of these other issues -- all the way to the other end, where you try to deal with things through things like the Opportunity Fund to say that those problems that we'll address here will provide some while we focus on the major rivers. Then, if you carve out the piece to try and support some of those efforts, is it 10% or is it more? That's where this is coming from.</p>
	<p>Is it clear now on where these seven different alternatives have come from and that they're not the only ones that we want your input and ideas on? It is the basic question that the Board decided there were several issues that they wanted this Citizens Committee to weigh in on, relative to the Plan and updating it and, topically, this is one of the topics that they have identified. [Tamie Kellogg]</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> The Board of Supervisors is the County Council, right?</p> <p>After this committee met in 2006, then in 2007, the County Council created the so-called Advisory Committee, right? In 2007 the 15 municipalities then started wagging the Board of Supervisors, which is the County Council, and the Advisory Committee suggested that maybe there's an Opportunity Fund and maybe 10% should be carved out. They made that decision in 2008 and the Board of Supervisors, that is the County Council, bought into it unanimously. And, now, you are presenting to us the seven alternatives on how that money might be re-used or allocated – or the allocation determined. By giving us these seven recommendations, or alternatives, I suppose, that at some point we will be asked to either make a recommendation as the Citizens Committee. Is that true?</p> <p>At some point are we going to seek a vote or a consensus from us that will be presented?</p> <p>How is it going to be presented if [commenter name] and I are the only two guys that think the whole thing should be scrapped and sold?!</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>As the Citizens Committee member, you are being asked right now, today, to weigh in on what you think about these different kinds of alternatives. Or, if you want, suggest a different alternative, altogether. Yes, that is what you're being asked.</p> <p>No. It is going to be presented.</p> <p>What they want, as decided by the Board, not by us, is that you are a sounding board. They want a diverse array of interests on this Committee. This decision was made by the Board. What they asked for was a sounding board on these different issues. What we're trying to do, is present some of these issues and get some input from you. What we want to do is capture the range of comments that we've heard, so that we can convey that to the Board. Ultimately, they are going to have a similar set of comments from the Advisory Committee that represents City jurisdictional input, so side-by-side, they can sit there and the Board of Supervisors can say, this is what we've heard from the Citizens stakeholder group,</p>

Well, I see that the Advisory Board has bought in wholesale, nine to zip, in 2008, in establishing this fund and how it should be administered. So, explain to me how this assembled group is going to be making a presentation to the Board. If I'm going to be voting on this in July, I'd like to know that it's clear in my mind all of these issues. And, Tamie said I can't debate this issue and I'm going to send you an email disagreeing with that.

What you are capturing, is what you've presented to us. So, are you going to say that three people have agreed with #5 and four with #2?

this is what we've heard from the jurisdictional group. With this input in mind, we're now prepared to make some decisions.

The point is, on the debate issue, is that if the purpose of the group is to come up with a set of recommendations that everyone agrees on, where there is consensus, then there is a lot of back-and-forth and time spent on getting to some shared and agreed-upon language. This is a different construct. Going back to what's in the Charter, this is a sounding board. The Board has asked for a range of input. What we're trying to do is capture the different perspectives we're hearing on this so that we can give a written report to the Board of Supervisors. That's what they've asked us to do.

It's a decision based on input.

Let's take a couple more minutes and try to answer the questions around how this information is going to be conveyed and then we'll figure out if this needs to come back to the group again and you need to have more dialog around it. We are not attempting to stop dialog on the topic. But, the Board of Supervisors asked for input from you. It doesn't only have to be about these seven alternatives. We are not limiting you to talking about these seven things, but the topic has been brought up by the Board of Supervisors and they have asked for input from the Citizens Committee – they want a sounding board. [Tamie Kellogg]

Again, the options you are seeing here are not things that we, as staff, developed on our own. These are things that have come up in the discussions with all of the people that are a part of this process. One point of clarification on the Opportunity Fund – the Opportunity Fund didn't come out of a recommendation from the Advisory Committee. It was established by the Board when it first set up the District. The first thing they said in there was 10% will be set aside for a sub-regional Opportunity Fund; we are going to ask the Advisory Committee to tell us how that should be structured. So, that's what the Advisory Committee did. And, they were unanimous in their support for the approach we described.

**Committee Member Comment:** Two points. I actually made a joke after seeing the minutes from the last meeting that that's how I think they're doing it. The minutes are exhaustive. Every single thing that comes out of our mouths is recorded in

I want to clarify what we're going to do. We are keeping exhaustive notes because the Council staff people do read them – and I'm not making that up. Our plan is to take

<p>the minutes. That's how they're going to report it. It's just going to be a reading of the minutes.</p> <p>Two, in terms of options. I'm with [name of commentator]. I would like to see something in this that makes the jurisdictions play nice with one another and think about how they are impacting each other.</p>	<p>those exhaustive notes and enter them into a summary document so that they don't have to read all the minutes – but that we've captured it so that they can see the full discussion.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I concur with what [name of commentator] had to say here. I feel that we are kind of in a forced choice conversation here. There seems to be a real demand on you all to try and make sure everything is fair. And, we all know that life isn't fair and you can't make perfect fairness out of anything. One of the things I would suggest in terms of this topic is why don't you focus back on what your mission was initially and stay hard and true to that. Because it looks like you're being asked to be pulled this way and that way. And, a good answer is, hey, that's not our mission. I think you could avoid some of the conflicts here. I saw this as sort of a forced choice type thing. And, I wonder why we even need to do this except to make it fair – and I'm not too sure that should figure into it.</p> <p>Yes. Let me just add one other thing. I can tell you the perspiration in terms of budgeting. You guys are going to be asked to do a lot of things. And, they're going to put that kind of pressure on because their budgets are getting squeezed. I think it's important that we utilize the resources that we've allocated as best we can toward what we're doing. And, make sure that is what sticks on the wall.</p>	<p>So, just to clarify. When it was first set up, it was a 90/10 including the Opportunity Fund. Your preference would be to pretty much stay focused on the way it was originally designed.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> With the con for alternative #1, I don't know where this 120 days comes from. I don't see any 120 days in RCW. 86.12.200. There must be some other regulation.</p> <p>I agree with what the gentlemen have said before. I am concerned with the County placing so many rules and regulations on itself that it's shooting itself in the foot, so to speak. I tend to not like alternatives #3 and #4. Because they're putting in a rule or regulation and in the process they might skip a really important project.</p>	<p>We'll find the correct citation.</p> <p>[Steve Bliefuhs] It's in RCW 86.12.210.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I was thinking, it's not so much an issue of fairness. The real critical thing here is, how do we use this money to really address the most effective solution, because flooding is not happening specifically in one jurisdiction and causing that problem. The problems are outside of it and it is all connected. We have to approach this in a way that looks broadly at what is going on in the landscape. #1 and #7 are very helpful to this. Really, the others which follow are #2, #3 and #5 are risk-based. If you are going to assess risk, you have to assess the condition of the problem itself to come up with an appropriate risk-based assessment. I think in order to get to the right solution you have to look at the overall approach and then you're being fair.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> Cities cause a lot of problems with [muffled] and there's a lot of discussion with communities to actually routing stormwater systems into open areas... so my statement here is that I think that even for this, there have to be some standards. If they want to use this 10% fund, to say, reroute those first floods in those areas. If they meet the larger objectives to hold that water to prevent it from going and causing urban flooding, then that should be</p>	

<p>supported. I think that if you can incentivize some discussion among the communities along the river, then they should.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I think the Opportunity Fund is great. I think it's just a question of how the funds are allocated. I think that alternative #5 is a very good one and is a good place to start because there is not a lot of room in this water plan where there is room for ideas and I think it's the only space where you can get this kind of local input on these kinds of ideas that you may not think of at the 30,000 foot elevation, kind of looking down on this. But, you can get these ideas to come up and I like the idea that it's competitive, and I agree that the smaller jurisdictions may be at a disadvantage, but you could encourage them, since this is really, very much a system problem, that they could potentially collaborate in joint proposals – or however you want to consider it – where they can kind of team up and maybe convince them of the broader goals. So, I strongly support #5, but I also like #7 as well – and it could be a hybrid.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I looked at these alternatives and I thought to myself, why do we have so many alternatives? Why don't you take #1 and take every key element out of these other ones and put them in that #1.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I do like the Opportunity Fund and I think they did the right thing in the first place and that 10% is fine. The one alternative that tweaks with that the least is #4. The allocation is automatic, so there's no real additional work for staff. You basically know what you're going to be getting. But it also tweaks it a little bit so if you have a large CIP project in your jurisdiction and you're small, you're already getting a lot of benefit, so it does concentrate those funds a little bit. Have you looked at how much the other jurisdictions would get?</p>	<p>Yes. It mostly depends on the CIP. For the standard flood plain, for the cities, it's about a million dollars.</p>
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I'd stick with the 10% and I agree that if there were a few criteria put on it, then work with a competitive Opportunity Fund to sweeten it for those that are really going above and beyond.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> I think alternative #6 is out of the question. We don't need to dip into more money.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> It seems like when we wrote this last plan, you guys had a list of projects that were critical and we were identifying funding to those projects. I think the Plan made all of this worse. I mean, to me, now this has become really, really complicated. I thought when we had finished the last one that we had identified how we were going to get the money, we were going to take all these different flood jurisdictions and put them all together, you were going to have a list of the projects that were in some kind of order on getting them done, and this was a ten-year plan and this is what we were going to do. I just don't get all this.</p>	<p>We still have that list, based on the criteria that you all developed in that Plan and enhanced in the way we described earlier. That list is what we've been working on for the last four years. We've focused on the highest priority ones. Those projects are very much part of what's in the CIP. But we'll be getting to the action plans and updating them and modifying those action plans for each river basin in a couple of months. Right now, in the course of implementing the projects, with that funding, issues come up, as we've gone from the Plan as an idea to forming a new government with a new property tax and a whole new group of people on a much broader scale and looking at it much more closely than they were when it was based on a \$4 million program. What we're dealing with now is these issues that have come up where the Board has asked for this group to provide some guidance to them.</p>

<p><b>Committee Member Comment:</b> When you're dealing with small watersheds, it's competitive against a goal, but not competitive against each other. I think that can be very, very positive. In looking at big rivers, we have an interest of the small watersheds containing them so they don't produce basin flooding, then the competitive nature between upstream waters and downstream waters can be really counterproductive.</p>	
<p><b>Committee Member Question:</b> I read here about the dichotomy between river flooding and stormwater and you mentioned earlier some of the Opportunity Funds used by municipalities to enhance their stormwater management, which I suspect is probably replacing inadequate small pipes, leaky pipes. So, from your point of view, public risk-wise, how do you equate the risks and damages to the public from stormwater problems?</p> <p>You don't understand my question. I'm talking about the risk to society, to our community, from stormwater problems versus river flooding.</p>	<p>I don't know if I have a real good answer to that question.</p> <p>For the Opportunity Fund, to be clear, we do not do any evaluation of those projects except to say that it is compliant with RCW governing flood districts. We look to the jurisdictions to do that. Cities and King County are to use it with things that are consistent with Flood District legislation.</p> <p>NOTE: The 10% is currently not risk based.</p>

20 MINUTES	GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS/PREPARATION FOR NEXT MEETING	BRIAN MURPHY
------------	--	--------------

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS	KING COUNTY RESPONSE
<p><b>General Public Comment:</b> The way I'm understanding it is that currently, this 10% is allocated by jurisdictional boundaries. And, I agree with [previous commenter] that it makes a lot more sense to look at the stream system and the effectiveness and the advocacy and the protection of the public in relationship to the water system.</p>	
<p><b>General Public Comment:</b> I would like to agree with that statement from a mitigation and disaster management standpoint. Wherever we could reduce loss of property and people is where we would put the priority.</p>	