

# King County Flood Hazard Management Plan Update Citizen's Committee Meeting # 6

MINUTES JULY 10, 2012

MERCER ISLAND COMMUNITY AND EVENT CENTER

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| <b>FACILITATOR</b>   | Tamie Kellogg, Kellogg Consulting Inc.   |
| <b>NOTE TAKER</b>    | Melissa Plotsky  |
| <b>ATTENDING</b>     | <b>Committee Members:</b> Bob Freitag, Dave Gashler, Warren Halverson, Joe Herr, Martha Parker, Brian Winslow<br><b>King County Staff and Consultants:</b> Saffa Bardaro, Priscilla Kaufmann, Clint Loper, Brian Murray, Jeanne Stypula, Monica Walker               |
| <b>NOT ATTENDING</b> | <b>Committee Members:</b> Leonard Carlson, Emily Fortman, Nicole Hagestad, John King, Molly Lawrence, Gilbert Pauley, Jeff Randall, Jon Scholes, Keith Swenson, Joseph Wartman<br><b>Note:</b> Steven Stanley, has resigned from the Committee for personal reasons. |

## AGENDA TOPICS

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>5 MINUTES</b>   | <b>WELCOME AND STAFF INTRODUCTIONS</b>  | <b>TAMIE KELLOGG</b>                    |
|  | Tamie Kellogg welcomed meeting attendees and thanked them for participating, briefly introduced the purpose of the meeting, and had all members briefly introduce themselves.   |   |
| <b>5 MINUTES</b>   | <b>HOUSEKEEPING</b>   | <b>TAMIE KELLOGG &amp; BRIAN MURRAY</b> |
| <b>DISCUSSION</b>  | Tamie went over the June meeting minutes and Brian briefly discussed each Summary Section. There were no comments or changes to meeting minutes.  |   |
| <b>25 MINUTES</b>  | <b>EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE: OUTREACH TO VULNERABLE AND UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS</b>  | <b>SAFFA BARDARO</b>                    |
| <b>DISCUSSION</b>  | <p><b>Key questions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What networks can we build or enhance to improve our delivery of the Flood Education and Flood Preparedness Program to vulnerable or historically underserved populations?</li> <li>2. How can we assess the effectiveness of outreach to vulnerable and underserved populations, knowing that this is a very difficult population to assess by traditional survey methodology?</li> <li>3. What networks can we build or enhance to improve our delivery of the flood risk reduction programs to vulnerable or historically underserved populations? What alternative mitigation options could be proposed for special needs, such as low-income, physical or developmental disabilities?</li> </ol>  |   |
| <b>SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE COMMENTS</b>                           | The Committee asked for some clarification on terminology used when discussing vulnerable and underserved populations. There was interest in how to track the effectiveness of the outreach efforts. In addition to web site hits, a suggestion was made for a more qualitative assessment using focus groups. The Committee was most interested in the idea of equity. County staff clarified that reasonable efforts need to be made to make services available, and in some cases it may not be reasonable to provide services to every single person, such as when there is only a very small group that speaks a specific language. Several excellent suggestions were offered, including partnering with the local Housing Authorities, working with tech-savvy teens, identifying community leaders, and educating primary caregivers for the young and disabled on flood response. Another recommendation was to include information in outreach materials about the benefits and opportunities created by flooding. Finally, a paper by Louise Comfort was brought to the attention of the Committee which points out information in and of itself doesn't result in action. What results in action depends on who says it. So this goes back to reinforce the suggestion to identify community leaders. |   |
| <b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS</b>                                      | <b>KING COUNTY RESPONSE</b>   |   |
| The slide says "Chinese combined" – what does "combined mean?" | <b>[Saffa Bardaro]</b> "Chinese combined" refers to Mandarin, traditional, simplified and Cantonese.  |   |
| What is a "client of the criminal justice system?"             | <b>[Saffa Bardaro]</b> An inmate.   |   |
| Why not just "inmate"?   | <b>[Saffa Bardaro]</b> I didn't write this. It's not my own terminology.  |   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Do you track the YouTube videos to see that people are actually viewing them? If you have them translated into 21 languages and you get only one hit, is it really worth it? Are they getting hits?</p>   | <p><b>[Saffa Bardaro]</b>That's the good thing about YouTube – you actually can track how many hits each video gets. There are some languages where there are thousands of views and there are some where there are a couple of hundred. People are using them. We want the videos to go viral. They tend to get a ton of hits when there is a flood event. It is very encouraging that they are being looked at. Interestingly enough, the English language video has a lot of hits on it, too. I didn't expect that.</p>   |
| <p>Have you considered partnering with the local Housing Authorities? The King County Housing Authority sends out a quarterly newsletter to something like 19,000 families. I think you could get really good coverage there. They do translate it into Vietnamese and Russian.</p>  | <p><b>[Saffa Bardaro]</b>That's a great suggestion and I will make a note to do that. We're also partnering with the American Red Cross, as we feel like they are the experts in emergency response and we have the knowledge. And we can provide the knowledge to them in ways that people can use it. That's our main objective.</p>   |
| <p><b>[Public Comment]</b>I have a couple of things to say. I have worked with a group of parents in a program called The Ground Up and the teenagers are incredibly internet savvy, while their parents may not be. So, working with younger groups may be more of an access point to the older ones. The other point is that I'm involved in a co-op in Del Ridge and people say to find a leader in the community to work with.</p>   | <p><b>[Saffa Bardaro]</b>Yes. That's what we did with the flood videos. We found people from each community who were recognized in their own communities to be our narrators and the spokespeople for us. It worked really well. It was very successful. We didn't spend a lot of money on it and it was very successful in terms of the product that we got. I'm thinking what else can we do like that. I need more ideas like that. What else can we do?</p>  |
| <p>What do you mean by "equitably" in the previous slide?</p>  | <p><b>[Tamie Kellogg]</b>It's referring to the big picture question – that we're providing services equitably.</p> <p><b>[Saffa Bardaro]</b>I would say it means that everyone has equal access to programs. For example, in the Flood Elevation program, are we providing that service equitably? Does everyone have equal access to that? Right now, they don't. You have to be able to afford to do the flood elevation. You might be at equal flood risk with your neighbor, but if you can't afford out of pocket expense and they can, does that mean that you can't get your home elevated? How are we managing that? That's just an example. I don't want to pick on that program because people love that program. Yet, at the same time the issue has been raised and we need to be thinking about it.</p> |
| <p>There isn't a means test for elevation. They just have to be able to afford the percentage that's set. So, if I make a million dollars and you make less than a million, you'd still pay 75% of mine and 75% of yours. You could have equity as progressive issue, which is being talked about. In statement of issues, I'd like you to put a fourth one in there whenever you have the chance. I'd like you to say to "enhance opportunities provided by floods." Not just reduce risk, but enhance opportunities. We talk about floods as natural capital and we talked about services provided by floods. We've talked about this before. Floods and flooding restores water, recharges aquifers, and distributes water so it can be processed, etc. The watershed is certainly a service. Because we think about flooding as natural, we tend to emphasize risk reduction. But the other side of risk reduction is enhancing opportunities.</p> |  |
| <p>I think there are a couple of things you want to look at. First is the nature of the media that is being sent. Does it really communicate what you want it to? Then there's the distribution, and, finally, there's end user populations. You might consider two or three methodologies to get to that population. Maybe you just need a few general questions. Maybe do a focus group instead of a quantitative analysis. As far as partnering goes, don't create something new, just improve your partnering.</p>   |  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>I want to go back to the word “equitable.” This is so hypothetical, but say that a family moves here and doesn’t speak language that is on your list. There’s five of them and their language isn’t on the list. Do we now have to allocate resources across the board to these five people? Using the word “equitable” makes it seem like everyone in each population is going to get the same treatment as English speaking populations. How can you do that with limited funds every time someone with a new language comes in?</p> | <p><b>[Saffa Bardaro]</b>We don’t. The keyword is “reasonable effort.” There aren’t enough resources to do that. It does have to be a reasonable effort to reach the population. That’s why we don’t print materials in every language. We might make it available, but perhaps I wouldn’t print a brochure in a language that only a handful of people speak. I might translate it for \$40 and make sure it’s available should someone request it. That’s the key: to make sure there isn’t anyone excluded from what you’re doing, while making sure that they have access to the information. It doesn’t have to be accessed in the same way as information to larger populations.</p> |
| <p><b>[Public Comment]</b>I don’t want to be redundant, but it seems that educating the caretakers [of the disabled] would make sense.</p>  |  |
| <p>There’s a paper by Louise Comfort. The gist is that she that information doesn’t really result in action. What results in action depends on who says it. If you say something and there’s a buzz in the community and then people hear it from their neighbors, then it’s really good. If the information is presented in way that gives them control; for instance, if it’s presented like “here are certain things you can do” that tends to work. Make the message actionable.</p>  |  |
| <p>You started off showing us a slide of all the different languages that are spoken in the Flood Plain. Did this information come from census bureau? I’m wondering if you could get more exact information, such as the exact of location of people speaking each language in relation of flooding.</p>   | <p><b>[Saffa Bardaro]</b>We have that information on the Flood Plain maps.</p>   |

**40 MINUTES      WHITE RIVER STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN      JEANNIE STYPULA**

**DISCUSSION**      **Key question:** Has King County adequately identified the flooding and erosion hazards on the White River and developed a reasonable strategy and set of actions to address those hazards?

**SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

The Committee comments focused on several topics: how to manage flood waters, gravel removal, floodplain development regulations, and management of open space. One Committee member offered an approach to managing flood waters where the 10-year or 20-year floods would be allowed to inundate the floodplain rather than trying to keep those low flows in the river channel. This approach also recommended the placement of “friction devices” in the floodplain to help with the erosional forces of overbank flooding. Staff pointed out that the US Army Corps of Engineers is exploring the placement of log jams within the River channels of the White River, which would serve the same purpose for reducing flood velocities. A lot of the Committee discussion focused on gravel removal with questions regarding whether King County would consider gravel removal on the White River. The Committee was reminded of the presentation at the previous meeting that outlined King County’s Sediment Management Program that would inform decisions related to when the County might consider gravel removal. A Committee member pointed out that times have changed and gravel removal cannot be conducted like it had been in the past without consideration of the impact on listed species and their habitat. The County should provide additional education to those who believe the County can return to the old practices of gravel removal. It was suggested that buyout of homes from willing sellers was preferable to large public works projects. Questions were asked about subdividing property and were told that floodplain regulations require at least 5,000 square feet of land outside the floodplain for all new lots created. A question was asked about the management of Lake Tapps and whether that lake can play a larger role in providing flood storage. Finally, questions were asked about floodplain property that is purchased and one Committee member believes King County manages the open space primarily for habitat with little opportunity for the general public to actively use the land.

**QUESTIONS/COMMENTS      KING COUNTY RESPONSE**

There’s another strategy for that. What you’re doing is trying to contain all of the water in the channel, the larger channel with the setbacks. You’re trying to increase it. My suggestion is that you consider trying to control sediment. Maybe even some mining some place, or call it something else. Then work toward the configuration of Pacific to accept flows. Don’t try and restrict any additional flows, but try to configure the community to accept flow.

People would elevate. Maybe even look at the roads and side channels. You try and keep a 10-year flood in the large channel and the sediment and you try and control the flow so you reduce velocity by distributing the flow over some kind of a weir. But then let the

**[Jeannie Stypula]**What do you mean by “configure the community?”

**[Jeannie Stypula]**I do think that there is certainly a perception that the Corps of Engineers should completely control the situation and not let anyone flood. I’ve heard that from residents in

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>community flood at maybe a 10- to 20- year flood, where there would be no damage. The water would spread out on over the flood plain.</p> <p>You will reduce the flows downstream. I think you have to say, "The strategy here is every 10 years you're going to going to flood." But we're going to fight what we can, which is the sediment, which will be an increasing problem, so there's a huge budget up there.</p>   | <p>the area. I think it's one of those education things: floods will happen. That's a given and we can only manage it to a certain extent.</p> <p><b>[Jeannie Stypula]</b>Yes. The White River has an amazing amount of sediment.</p>   |
| <p>The White River comes out directly out of Mt. Rainier. It has a tremendous amount of gravel. I know because I've traveled it. Normally rivers have eddies where you can rest. There is so much gravel that there are very few places where the river rests. How can the County even consider talking about gravel removal when gravel removal was stopped on the White in the late 80s and, supposedly, that caused the flooding in January 2009. The Mayor of Pacific told me in an email that he saw the river bed rise six feet. So, this gravel removal thing needs more discussion.</p> <p>I agree, but doesn't tell me about any action.</p> | <p><b>[Jeannie Stypula]</b>Terry gave a presentation at the last meeting about our sediment management program. The lower White River and some other locations in the County are actively monitored, as one step to understand how much volume of sediment is accumulating in different areas. Then we go from there and start to evaluate that in terms of hydraulics. We see changes in the river bed and then we have to understand how those changes are related to change in water elevation.</p> <p><b>[Jeannie Stypula]</b>That's what I'm leading to. We can do that evaluation. We call them "Gravel Removal Scenarios." We actively go into the hydraulic model and bar scalp different areas to see how we can get a flood risk benefit from gravel removal, to determine if it is an effective tool. It is in our Flood Plan.</p> |
| <p>How can you get that past the people that stopped the gravel removal in the first place?</p>   | <p><b>[Jeannie Stypula]</b>Well, I think that if you can demonstrate that there is a flood risk benefit and you can get your permits – we use the criteria from the State Fish &amp; Wildlife Hydraulic Code to set up our removal scenarios – it sets up the ability to justify if a project should go forward. That's the type of background technical information that the resource agencies and the permit agency require.</p>  |
| <p>In regard to the lower reach, there is some flood plain in that area, some flat land that is historic flood plain. You may be able actually to put some friction devices along the flood plain, not necessarily in the river, so that when it goes overbank you can increase the storage in that reach.</p>  | <p><b>[Jeannie Stypula]</b>It is very well wooded. I know that the Corps of Engineers is studying – and I do not know the purpose of it -- there will be some action on putting some engineered logjam structures down in the reach.</p>  |
| <p>You could do it off channel.</p>   |   |
| <p>When we talk through these action plans, can you list the areas where sediment removal plans will be done in next year or two?</p> <p>The reason I ask the question is that I've been through a couple of floods and I think if you talk to the general population, a lot of citizens relate to sediment removal and they know it's been done. And, they feel that there has been an effectiveness from sediment removal activities. Right now, I believe that you're not doing sediment removal. Are they're going to do sediment removal in the Sammamish WRIA area?</p>   | <p><b>[Jeannie Stypula]</b>I can't off the top of my head say that they will be done. I think the areas that Terry presented in his presentation, as the study regions, are where the work is being developed is part of the vast listing of where they could potentially be done.</p> <p><b>[Jeannie Stypula]</b>Yes, that's being looked at.</p>  |
| <p>I just want to say that the logjam and increasing buffers off channel should be something that King County should look at also. Not just the Corps. The Corps is going to concentrate obviously on areas that they have control over, but there are other areas that you would want to do that in.</p>   |   |
| <p>The levee setback is already in the works for segment two.</p>   |   |
| <p>No, I'm saying to flood as much as they can of the historic flood plain.</p>   |   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>There are two people. One buyer and a willing seller. I hope you're not thinking about a large public works project because, what you're saying is if they get flooded they invest part of it –</p>   | <p><b>[Jeannie Stypula]</b>The action plan here is to work with the residents, engaging them to see if they're interested in selling. They've been through some pretty serious flooding and we keep talking to them and letting them know that if they want to sell, we want to hear about it. They understand that.</p>  |
| <p>If you start to look at flood plan services and opportunities in that area, you may say that instead of looking at the risk there, what you have is the headwater and a lot of undeveloped flat land. You don't have to buy or restructure there to protect it from flooding. Allow it to flood and the structures can conform to the risk.</p>   | <p><b>[Jeannie Stypula]</b>That's one of the useful things about having flood studies and channel migration studies. When you put those together, you can really understand where the worst combination of hazards are and you can be really strategic about who is most at risk. Then you can help them understand the hazards of living there and being prepared for it. If they choose that they've had enough, then we'll consider how we might be able to buy them out.</p>  |
| <p>8<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge is the only bridge of five that has a center post. It's pretty old. I visited all of them and took pictures. None of the others have that problem. They're all quite high. I've seen farmers at community meetings pleading with the County to dredge the river. I think the County needs to be more open and above board about the new philosophy, which is to save fish. And, removing gravel is not good for saving fish. These older farmers and other people are under misconception that it can be done like it used to be done and not harm the fish. And, it's not true. I believe that the County needs to explain the new philosophy that there are far more restrictions on removing gravel now, than there was then.</p> |   |
| <p>When we start talking about implementation measures, when we talk about planning, the areas within these meander zones of these rivers and flood plains [muffled]... that you can't have plats isolated within those areas. So, I think you can put some constraints on subdivision, plats and planning of those areas.</p>   | <p><b>[Jeannie Stypula]</b>King County Code requires that if you want to subdivide in flood plain area, you then have to have 5,000 square feet outside of the flood plain. You can't just subdivide in a flood zone area.</p>  |
| <p>I would expand on that. In these areas the flood plain may not be sufficient.</p>   | <p><b>[Jeannie Stypula]</b>There are other tools and different ways to protect those natural systems. And, certainly in the County code we have other requirements, so that those development proposals that are in the flood plain area don't cause upstream events.</p>   |
| <p>I've never really understood the Puget Sound Energy Diversion and why Lake Tapps can't be used as more of a source. They practically drain that lake in the winter. You would think that if you were going to have a flood event that thing would hold a lot of water.</p>  | <p><b>[Jeannie Stypula]</b>The short story is there is an agreement there now. Many people live around lake. There is a very high value on lake recreation. And, of course, there are docks geared to certain elevations of lake. So, in the past, Puget Sound Energy worked to keep the lake up to a certain level for hydropower production. It was important to them to keep hydropower reservoir levels up. The amount of water that can be shunted into the flumes is about 2,000 cubic meters per second. That's the maximum size. If you had flood event and Corps was using their 12,000, you could take 2,000 off. It comes back in at Sumner, so you only get some elevation benefit in one part of the river. And, it's not really that much. Now, back to the lake elevation situation now, Cascade Water Lines purchased that Lake Tapps area and its system from Puget Sound Energy. They negotiated, through a variety of different regulatory agencies and the Lake Tapps Task Force, to maintain recreational lake levels, while Cascade Water Lines diverts water only for the purpose of having a new water supply source out of Lake Tapps. It's all about lake recreation and the fact that you can only take so much water into the limited size flume space.</p> |
| <p>So, the thing you showed that looks like a river is not one?</p>  | <p><b>[Jeannie Stypula]</b>On the map, the flume system is actually a combination of trapezoidal, open channel, and some square cedar-lined plank</p>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | flume. And, parts of it are concrete. It varies. And, it gets a lot of sediment in it. They have to routinely dredge it out to maintain the 2,000 cubic meters per second.  |
| How much support are you getting from the Muckleshoot?  | <b>[Jeannie Stypula]</b> They have been very supportive of the County line projects. And, they have been supportive of the flood study work that we have been doing. Actually, the Muckleshoot are partners in the Trans Canada Feasibility Study. They signed a letter of support for our grant. They actually owned an old stored channel in that so they really want to see that project go forward.   |
| What happens to land that has been purchased? Does it become part of King County ownership and can no longer be developed for any purpose but to handle flood control?  | <b>[Jeannie Stypula]</b> We're acquiring these properties because they are a flood risk, so it's a way of permanently resolving that problem. They go into permanent open space, and at times when we know we have the best engineering line for a levee setback and something is in the way, we purchase those lands because that's where levee will then be built. They do result in permanent open space for passive recreation and are there for flood storage.<br><br><b>[Brian Murray]</b> Just to make sure that folks know what "permanent open space" is, it's a deed restriction and it's on the title. |
| A small community of the Cedar River Council did a study of the Cedar River land ownership and found 90 parcels owned mostly by the County, some by the State, and motorists and recreationists were allowed 13 of the 90 parcels. This tells you that for the great majority, the public isn't allowed on it. So, we're talking about open space and we're talking about open space for ecological reasons and not for public use. |   |
| Assuming that the public doesn't benefit from ecological use --   |   |
| Of course it does, but as far as actual use --I'm talking about use of the term "recreational."   |   |

|            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| 25 MINUTES | RELOCATION OF RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL TENANTS | BRIAN MURRAY |
|------------|--|--------------|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>DISCUSSION</b>   | <p><b>Key Questions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When land is acquired for flood risk reduction purposes and tenants are displaced, what types of relocation assistance should be provided?</li> <li>2. Should any other steps be taken minimize disruptions to economic activity and mitigate possible impacts on economic development and local tax revenue?</li> </ol>   |
| <b>SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE COMMENTS</b>                      | The Committee asked for clarification on the relocation issue to understand that there are federal, state, and local regulations to provide assistance, but no guidance on working with cities to maintain the existing tax base that would be impacted if properties and businesses are purchased in their jurisdictions. One Committee member wanted to know how much land the County planned to purchase in the floodplain, and whether the ultimate goal is to remove all development from the floodplain. Has there been any assessment on the impact on the tax base for properties that have already been purchased? It was pointed out that taxes removed from one property ends up getting paid by others, so in general, there is no net loss of taxes, but who pays and the jurisdictions benefiting from the tax revenue might change. Finally, Committee members asked for clarification on who benefits from the relocation assistance and understood this applies to tenants only. |
| <b>QUESTIONS/COMMENTS</b>                                 | <b>KING COUNTY RESPONSE</b>   |
| Why wouldn't you be doing that [relocation] already?      | <b>[Brian Murray]</b> We are doing the relocation requirements already, that's a part of the law, but we do not have policy language currently that says anything about trying to keep --   |
| How would you not do this as part of negotiation process? | <b>[Brian Murray]</b> From the business and tax side, we would not necessarily be negotiating with the city in question to try and keep the business in that jurisdiction. All this would do is just clarify. Practically speaking, you're absolutely right, we   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | would try and find every way we could. This makes it clear. Part of it is that without this language, there would be folks who are made to feel uncertain and anxious by its absence. This hopefully helps to reassure them.   |
| The businesses are in the business of making something for somebody, not for their own selves. I think it makes a difference of understanding who they are making stuff for and how this move might impact that element of their business. They can't be down for two days or whatever.   |  |
| Where are we going with buy outs? How much land along all of the rivers of King County does the County want to own? I've heard 70% for the Cedar River. I haven't heard anything for the other rivers. What is the impact on County revenue of the County owning this much land? What is end result?  | <b>[Brian Murray]</b> I'll have to get back to you and do a bit more digging. As far as the performance measures go, in terms of what the need is and the acquisitions, and the number of at risk structures and the parcels we intend to requires, there is no set percentage like 70% or anything else for publicly owned flood plain.   |
| There must be some general philosophy. Own enough land so that there are no more structures left in the flood plain that are at risk? Is that the objective?  | <b>[Brian Murray]</b> I think that what you'll be hearing in the White River presentation and what you'll be hearing in the Snoqualmie and other action plans will give you a better sense of which ones are the highest priorities.   |
| These are all individual instances. For instance, the Legacy Program on the Cedar, where the County buys the land along the river has been going on for probably 10 years or more. Are there similar programs on other rivers? Has anyone done any financial studies as to when this is done, if it ever is, what will be the impact on County revenues -- all that real estate tax that is no longer being paid? | <b>[Brian Murray]</b> We could look into that and do an analysis, but the bottom line is that it doesn't affect the amount of tax collected. It changes who is paying those taxes.   |
| Are you telling me that the County pays itself?   | <b>[Brian Murray]</b> No, I'm telling you that the amount of revenue collected is the same and it gets spread over the rest of the parcels in the tax base. If we buy out a home that was paying \$40 into the Flood District in tax revenue, that \$40 dollars gets paid by someone else in the County.<br><br><b>[Tamie Kellogg]</b> I think the answer, philosophically, is that there isn't a vision statement. The philosophy on acquisition is done on a case by case and basin by basin basis.<br><br><b>[Brian Murray]</b> Without getting too much into what is described in the action strategies is that when we look at when to acquire and when to elevate, and when to do find a structural solution, that thought process looks at things like are we talking about a high velocity flow in the area, are we talking about the risk of sudden channel change. Those are things we don't want to try and fight. If we're talking about an inundation risk, we elevate homes a lot all of the time. In those situations, we're not proposing to buy people out. We look at what is most appropriate for health, safety and welfare. |
| I don't understand. To me, this looks like I have a mutual agreement with you that you are going to buy my house. Right? This is not adverse possession here. This is, I'm tired of being flooded – wow --  | <b>[Brian Murray]</b> No, this is just if you are a tenant. If Bob is a landowner who owns all of the adverse flood plain property and you're the tenant and we make an agreement to buy the homes from Bob and he gets his fair market value for the home, you as a tenant have rights under Federal and State law to get help relocating to superior housing.  |
| This doesn't say that. This says "owner occupant." If I'm an owner occupant, I'm going to get quite a deal. I'm going to get all kinds of entitlements.<br><br>That is the law?   | <b>[Brian Murray]</b> This is for tenant who is renting a space. Look on the second page.<br><br><b>[Brian Murray]</b> Yes, that is the law. It is in the Federal and State law and we are required to do this.  |

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| <b>DISCUSSION</b> | <p><b>Key question:</b> Has King County adequately identified the flooding and erosion hazards on the South Fork Skykomish and Snoqualmie Rivers and developed a reasonable strategy and set of actions to address those hazards?</p> |
|-------------------|---|

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <b>SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE COMMENTS</b> | <p>A Committee member pointed out that if buildings and other infrastructure are protected in some fashion, such as elevating the buildings, flooding can be a good thing from a biological standpoint as flooding provides natural functions and values that are a benefit to the ecosystem. It is worse on the environment to try and keep all the water in the channel during a flood event than to allow it to inundate the floodplain in a more natural manner. There is also a tremendous cost to trying to keep all the water in the channels, so there are costs in expenditures for building and maintaining levees as well as the ecological cost related to the loss of floodplain functions and values. A citizen attendee pointed out that the river valleys are also the primary source of food production and hoped the County was considering the impacts of climate change on flooding of agricultural lands. A question was asked if gravel removal is going to be part of the strategy for addressing flooding in this river basin. A recommendation was made to look at using acquisitions more broadly to consider the benefit of land for flood storage in addition to, or even as an alternative to acquiring property only because a structure is at risk. The Committee appreciated that the County is looking at a wide range of tools – elevations, buyouts, gravel removal, levees – to address the risk from flooding. A suggestion was offered to use the streams more effective for both transporting water as well as storing water for release during the dry season. A request was made to look at the opportunities for recreational use county-wide, not just on some river systems. Finally, a Committee member asked if the County ever considered relocating some roads, such as Jones Road (on the Cedar River). A citizen attendee pointed out that the Puget Sound Regional Policy Council is talking about transfer of development rights in relation to food and farming.</p> |
|--------------------------------------|---|

| QUESTIONS/COMMENTS  | KING COUNTY RESPONSE |
|---|----------------------|
| <p>For agricultural area, from a service standpoint, for the farm areas a lot of the agricultural pollutants – the cow manure -- can be prevented by preparing buffers and things as part of that whole process. That's something that I think, especially with biological cleaning, can be thought about as part of the project. Especially in areas when you want to capture inner flow. That scene you have down below [I the slide] is a very positive scene. That flooding is a very good thing as long as those properties are protected. It's a good thing – you're laughing, you don't think it's a good thing?</p> |                      |
| <p>I'm not laughing, but I am smiling because if you've been in those floods and you own property it's pretty devastating and it's really hard to see that as a good thing.</p>   |                      |
| <p>But, if there are pads and the homes are elevated. If that doesn't happen, then it is a very bad thing downstream or it's a very bad thing for the increased pollutants in the river. So, we have to think of this as a good thing. And, the people who use the land have to be protected, without keeping the water away. I mean, a bad thing would be to try and keep all of that water in the channel.</p>  |                      |
| <p>The solution that I would see, would be if you did exactly what you said and protected all of their land and all of their homes and all of their barns and all of their animals. Then I'd see it as a good solution.</p>   |                      |
| <p>The bad thing, from a biological standpoint, a services standpoint, a flood standpoint, would be, as the goal, to keep everything in the river. In these areas, homes could be elevated, barns could be elevated, and even if these were purchased to do that, you can keep the water there.</p>   |                      |
| <p>If the homes are elevated and the structures could take some of the flooding, we then have the little levee to keep the channel in place. So the channel is somewhat confined, and there's also less pressure on channel when you spread that water out through that entire area. You also have the flooding downstream and you have much cleaner water downstream. The chance of that occurring in the future is going to be dramatically increased.</p>  |                      |
| <p>I want to say one more thing that should be stressed. When you talk about the flood plain as capital services and you want to resurrect or recreate that capital, let's say you lose that and you put all of that water in the channel. The cost of putting water in the channel, just on the levees, is that the services that you eliminate by restricting that flood plain tend to cost. The replacement has to cost tremendous amounts of money. It's not just ecological functions.</p>   |                      |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>[Public Comment]</b>The other side of what we're talking about is that this is a place where food is produced. It is an agricultural area. In the long-term planning, are we considering the impact of increased population and the impending food crisis, which I fully believe is going to happen? What is King County going to do if one of their most productive food valleys? I don't know if that has been incorporated into this planning, but that has been why I've been at these meetings. I was at the meeting about responding to Climate Change and everything is set to 2050. I would hope that this planning process is looking that far into the future as well.</p>  |  |
| <p>Are you going to talk about accomplishments any further? On sheets that were handed out there were accomplishments for 2006 through 2012, which said that they did a gravel study in 2007. Yet, in the actions section, it doesn't show any actions about gravel management going forward.</p>   | <p><b>[Clint Loper]</b>Yes, it's in the South Fork Levee Improvement Project. It's another possible strategy for dealing with flooding. The results of that study kind of feed this project. It's in planning phase now.</p>   |
| <p>I want to say that evacuation is a strategy. The homes are elevated. So you evacuate and then come back to your home. It's not a negative.</p>   | <p><b>[Clint Loper]</b>In this kind of environment, we would agree that home elevations are good strategy.</p>   |
| <p>Earth Economics is looking at the cost feasibility of buying out homes that are not at risk at all, but provide a service such as storage. You should look not at risk reduction, but at opportunity enhancement, also. By buying out the land it produces more storage and more services for others.</p>  | <p><b>[Clint Loper]</b>I didn't mention this because it's actually more prevalent in the lower valley, but we have a lot of partnership projects, as well, so oftentimes there are places where there are homes that are at flood or channel migration risk, but they're also in areas that provide habitat or open space, so there are many occasions where we can partner and bring some funding from the flood side to reduce flood risk and flood hazard, but also create some open space that has some other values, as well. We actually do that very frequently in the lower valley. So, I think that's a good approach, too. I like that idea.</p> |
| <p>When we did the Plan last time, we did field trip where Tolt comes into Snoqualmie. There was going to be a big project there. Did that happen?</p>  | <p><b>[Clint Loper]</b>Yes, in 2008 or 2009.</p>   |
| <p>If you live in the flood plain, you live there for a reason. It's the environment. You love that kind of environment. It's a lifestyle and there are now different situations for diff people. I really appreciate you're looking at whole tool kit. In terms of social justice, most of us are old timers and are used to floods and can handle it. It's the younger people, from a social justice standpoint, that you want to take a look at. They haven't been in a flood; they don't understand it. The other thing is that we've talked a lot about rivers, but not streams. I think there are a lot of benefits of opening up the eco-system through the opening up of the streams. On the Snoqualmie, there are several streams. I hope that you wouldn't get so into the big projects that you wouldn't look at the simple things like opening up a stream. I'm not talking about building a levee or dredging, just open them up so they flow.</p> | <p><b>[Clint Loper]</b>That gets into the geographic scope issue.</p>  |
| <p>If you also make some of the streams more efficient at transporting water, there are also streams up there that you can make even less efficient in terms of transporting water and make them more efficient to store water. When we start to have increasingly hot, dry summers, just to keep that water up there for a couple of weeks, would be helpful.</p>  |  |
| <p>I think there's a lot of commonality in the various tools that you are considering for the rivers in King County. Some of these sheets have recreation considerations and some of them don't. I want you to ask you to add recreation to the South Fork and the Sky and maybe the Raging. It looks to me like you're using a combo of buy outs and elevations and repairs. Are you ever going to get into the idea of relocating some roads? There is a proposal I saw somewhere to relocate part of Jones Road along the Cedar. Will you ever consider relocating it?</p>   |  |

| QUESTIONS/COMMENTS  | KING COUNTY RESPONSE |
|---|----------------------|
| <p><b>[Public Comment]</b> I was following up on what Martha was saying. The Puget Sound Regional Policy Council is going to have a meeting on Friday and they're going to talk about transfer of development rights in relation to food and farming. I don't know where that fits on the Plan. They are also going to have a presentation about policy mapping for food development and I suggested that they include something about the impacts of flooding on the food system. I just thought you should know, in case anyone here wants to go to another meeting. I really believe in people integrating this consciousness about the food system with the water system and the land system.</p> |                      |